UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01689093 1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/nationaleducatio00rigguoft

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

NATIONAL EDUCATION

In its Social Conditions and Aspects, and

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

ENGLISH AND FOREIGN

By JAMES H. RIGG, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF WESTMINSTER TRAINING COLLEGE, AND MEMBER OF THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD,

AUTHOR OF "MODERN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY," "ESSAYS FOR THE TIMES ON ECCLESIASTICAL AND SOCIAL SUBJECTS," ETC. ETC.

112798
291.5/11

STRAHAN & CO.
56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
1873

LONDON:
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO.,
CITY ROAD.

PREFACE.

NATIONAL education is a much wider and deeper matter than it is generally taken to be. One object of the following chapters is to indicate how much wider and deeper it is.

Foreign systems of popular education are generally misconceived in this country. I have endeavoured in the following pages to set forth truly the character and the leading principles of the great typical systems of school education, European and American.*

What are spoken of as abstract principles are best discussed under the light of concrete experience and fact. The experience of Europe and America, in connection with various systems of school education, when truly ascertained and understood, affords a

* I had intended to sketch the Canadian system, but found that the limits of the volume would not allow this. Here I may remark that it includes two classes of schools, the Protestant common schools, for all denominations, and a separate provision for Roman Catholic schools, under special management. Some recent articles in the London Newspaper Press, in which it has been stated that in Canada the problem of common schools for all denominations has been solved, ignore the fact that there is in Canada this special and separate provision for Roman Catholics.

luminous commentary on the meaning and working of such principles as enter into the educational questions and controversies of this country at the present time. This, I hope, is made to appear in the course of the volume which I now offer to the consideration of the friends of national education.

That school provision alone, or even when supplemented by legal compulsion, so far as this can be applied, can never avail, apart from measures of social reform, to secure the true education of the people of England, is one of the conclusions which I have sought to demonstrate in this volume.

At the same time I have endeavoured to indicate on what principles it is possible approximately to solve the question of popular school education for England for the present transitional period, and on what principles the question must be ultimately and permanently solved.

There is no definite school of propagandism in regard to the educational controversy in England from which I do not materially differ, and none with which I do not more or less agree, although I differ more from the Birmingham school than any other, and can only wonder how some of the men who have connected themselves with that school can have departed so far from the sound principles, on the subject of National Education, taught by one whose writings they might have been expected highly to appreciate ; I mean that great economist, the late John Stuart Mill.

Some of my readers will recognise here and there in the following pages passages which they have met with before. The subject of National Education, in the highest and most comprehensive sense, has been the study of my life, and during the last fifteen years I have often written about it in reviews, and have, in the course of my duty as Principal of a Training College, delivered a number of inaugural addresses in relation to different aspects of the great question. The chapter on "Primary Education in Ireland" was originally published, almost as it stands in this volume, as an article in the *London Quarterly Review.** Some pages, also, in the second chapter have been published in a former volume which dealt partly with social subjects. The following chapters, however, not only, as I hope it will be admitted, form a real whole, but, for the most part, consist of fresh matter, now newly written.

A student and teacher through all my youth and in my earlier manhood; afterwards, during more than twenty years of very extensive and various intercourse with the middle and lower classes of the people, in most parts of England, and among mining manufacturing, and agricultural populations, as well as in large middle-class towns, continually intent upon the study of social and educational facts and needs; now, for five years past, having held the position of Principal in one of the largest Training Colleges in the Kingdom, and, for nearly three years,

* January, 1872.

having been a member of the London School Board, I venture to ask for what is set forth in the following pages the candid attention of those who desire to see England the home of an educated, provident, and self-respecting Christian people.

JAMES H. RIGG.

June 20, 1873.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	EDUCATION AND NATIONAL EDUCATION	1
II.	EDUCATION AND PROPERTY	42
III.	SCHOOL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES	91
IV.	POPULAR EDUCATION ON THE CONTINENT	143
V.	FREE EDUCATION	217
VI.	PRIMARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND	247
VII.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND	285
VIII.	SPECIAL FEATURES IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SYSTEM OF ENGLAND—PUPIL-TEACHERS—FEMALE TEACHERS—INFANT-SCHOOLS	326
IX.	THE RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTY	338
X.	RECENT LEGISLATION FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND	359
XI.	A FORECAST OF THE FUTURE	423
	APPENDIX	460

"Of all many-sided subjects, education is the one which has the greatest number of sides. Not only does it include whatever we do for ourselves, and whatever is done for us by others, for the express purpose of bringing us somewhat nearer to the perfection of our nature; it does more: in its largest acceptation, it comprehends even the indirect effects produced on character and on the human faculties, by things of which the direct purposes are quite different; by laws, by forms of government, by the industrial arts, by modes of social life; nay, even by physical facts not dependent on human will; by climate, soil, and local position. Whatever helps to shape the human being—to make the individual what he is, or hinder him from being what he is not—is part of his education. —Mr. Mill's "Inaugural Address, delivered to the University of St. Andrew's in 1867."

CHAPTER I.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.

IT is common to speak of national education, as if all that was or could be meant was a system of schools, or at most of schools and colleges, for the people. The schools of the nation, it is never doubted, will educate the nation. Education itself is truly understood—at least by most who have any thought about the matter—to mean instruction and training, to include the conveyance of knowledge, and the discipline and development of character. And all the world talks, nearly all public speakers speak, public journalists—with here and there, or now and then, a rare exception—write, as if all that is needed adequately to furnish the mind, and rightly to mould the character, of the generations which are coming forward, would be secured and determined by a proper and effective school education, made compulsory and universal.

My object in this chapter will be to show how serious a mistake is involved in this expectation—a mistake, indeed, fatal, as I conceive, to any prospect of attaining to a true solution of the all-important problem which presses for solution. Many years of study and observation, of inquiry and discussion, have

settled and sealed the conviction in my mind that the nation never will or can be educated, as a whole, until it is understood that schools can only furnish a part, perhaps hardly the most important part, of the education of the people. A nation may have a system of schools as complete as can be organized, and yet be very imperfectly educated. On the other hand, a nation might have a very imperfect system of schools, or no system of schools at all—might have none but purely voluntary schools, or none but voluntary and parochial or municipal schools, without anything like a State system, and yet might be much better educated, might be a people of better knowledge and of better character, than the people of another country where the system of schools was as complete and as theoretically perfect as could well be organized. At the same time it is, of course, true and beyond doubt that no nation can be thoroughly educated—can be as well educated as it ought to be—unless the national school education be thorough, and adequate to the national demands and capacities.

An educated man is a man who has the power and habit of forethought and of self-control, and has also knowledge and mental discipline adequate to his position and opportunities in life. So an educated nation is one which, taken collectively, may be said to have the power and habit of forethought and of self-control, and knowledge and mental discipline adequate to its position and opportunities. Class by class this character should be predicable of all the people. National education in the wide, adequate, true sense, which we are now thinking of, is the course of discipline, or the combination of influences, by means of which the whole nation, throughout its various

classes, is brought under the control of good habits, habits of moral reflection, of providence, of self-restraint, and is furnished with the requisite knowledge and mental discipline to enable it to discharge efficiently all the duties, and to embrace the fair opportunities, which belong to its position. When the scope of national education is thus indicated, a little reflection will serve to show that school education cannot do more than furnish a fractional part of the total sum of a thorough and effective national education.

National education, thus regarded, will be seen to include—besides the general, pervasive, influence of religion—the influences of home and family, of street, school, work-place,—be this a shop, or office, or factory, or pit, or simple chamber,—of each person's business, craft, or profession, of society, of civil and political duties and ideas, of the public press, including books and journals, especially the cheapest and most widely circulated of these, and finally of all life's prizes to each man, as these successively come into view, that is, in other words, of the various motives, incentives, and opportunities which stir up desire and suggest or determine action. All these things, and such things as these, go to elicit, to mould, to form and fix character. The process begins with the first opening of life, and continues through all life's stages, until the character has been determined in its final maturity. In the sum-total of this human education the schooling of the child is but one among many important elements.

The influences of home and family are yet more important than those of schools ; they precede, surround, and interpenetrate all the ideas and impressions which

make up the sum of the school education. Unless the school discipline is searching and thorough, uninterrupted and long continued, it is likely to avail little indeed against the injurious influences of an ignorant and immoral home. It is probably safe to say that half of the children who have gone to the public elementary schools of England have been but little better morally and humanly, still less intellectually, for the irregular, often little more than nominal, attendance at school,—the school itself too commonly a very inferior school,—which has constituted their title to be counted among the number of English school children. And, whatever be the merit and efficiency of the school teaching and training, whatever, also, the regularity of attendance (under, let us suppose, an effective compulsory law), it is certain that adverse home influences will, to a lamentable and most discouraging extent, counteract the good effects of school attendance. Decent and virtuous homes are, accordingly, a necessary preliminary condition to a good and effective national education. The children of a people can never be well educated, if their parents live under family conditions incompatible with self-respect or with moral purity.

The education of the streets, again, has, in this country, up to the present time, been commonly such as largely to counteract the best school influences. If the nation is to be educated, the streets must be cleared of ignorant and neglected children; for the sake not only of those children themselves, but of the children of better families, who will else learn vice and lawlessness in the streets.

The homes, the streets, and the schools themselves may be said not only to furnish the distinct lessons of

early life to children, but the educational atmosphere in which they live. If this atmosphere has been wholesome and kindly, pure and genial, and if the actual instruction and the systematic training given in the school has been good and sufficient, the process of national education may be said to have been successfully carried forward up to the close of the school age. But national education must by no means stop here, if it is not to be a failure. German school education has, in some of the States at least, been good for more than one generation, good, continuous, and thorough; nevertheless, as respects many of the qualities and habits most necessary to individual success and national advancement, the Germans not only have been, but are yet, greatly inferior to the English, whose school education has been so grievously wanting, and still more to the people of the United States, whose school education, as a whole, is, as I shall presently show, less systematic and thorough than even that of England. The successes of German arms, a branch of "art" and service in which all classes of the nation have been equally and universally educated, as diligently as ever they were taught in their *Real-schulen* or their Gymnasia, must not mislead our judgment in regard to this point. Notwithstanding their superior education, and notwithstanding their superior providence and thrift,—qualities which the German people owe, as we shall soon see, to another sort of education than that which they obtain at school,—German workmen, taken as a whole class, are inferior to English workmen; and German tradesmen, and men of business generally, are inferior in promptitude, enterprise, and business energy, to the English. This is owing in part to the

absurd restrictions and limitations under which the various handicrafts and other occupations of the Germans have been carried on for ages, and are still to a considerable extent carried on, notwithstanding recent reforms. Liberty is the spring of life. In England the crafts and trades have long had perfect legal liberty; in Germany the reverse has been the case. Over-governing in all spheres and in all directions has been the vice of German governments. On this point, the Rev. Mark Pattison, in his report to our Education Commission on German Popular Education, both speaks himself very suggestively and quotes some striking remarks from Mr. Horace Mann's "Educational Tour." "When the children," says Mr. Mann, "come out from the school, they have little use either for the faculties that have been developed, or for the knowledge that has been acquired. Their resources are not brought into demand; their powers are not roused and strengthened by exertion. Our common phrases, 'the active duties of life,' 'the responsibilities of citizenship,' 'the career of action,' 'the obligations to posterity,' would be strange-sounding words in a Prussian's ear. Government steps in to take care of the subject almost as much as the subject takes care of his cattle. The subject has no officers to choose; no inquiry into the character of candidates to make; no vote to give," &c. Mr. Pattison says, "The influence of the elementary school on national character and national civilisation appears to have been estimated too highly, and power ascribed to it which it does not possess. It is not till after fourteen, till he has come into contact with the social order as it is arranged for him, that the German youth acquires that torpor which is so much

complained of, and that which was docility in the child, develops into stupidity, submissiveness, and a mechanical routine existence. As soon as he leaves school, he ceases to learn or to have any motive for doing so. No one around him thinks of acquiring information except in his own pursuit. He is content to pursue with a sort of military precision the track of his profession, and its adherent information. He is the creature of forms, and walks leisurely by rule."*

The value of the school education is, that it immediately prepares for the active duties of life in youth and manhood. But if it closes the preparatory education of the child, it lies only on the threshold of the education of the youth and rising man. Whether the school education shall prove to be worth much or little, depends as much on what follows in life's actual work as on what precedes and accompanies in home influences. The passages I have just quoted as to German education will have furnished an illustration of this truth. In the after education which develops the seeds of knowledge and the germs of character which the school has planted or fostered, England is, for all classes of her people, except the lowest, peculiarly rich. Except her own colonies and the United States, there is no country in the world to compare in this respect with our own. From the bare, low ground, indeed, on which the peasant stands to the lowest rung of the ladder of advancement is a height which exceedingly few peasants have strength or skill to climb. But for all who are placed already by birth and early advantages above that interval, even though it be but on the lowest

* Reports of Assistant Commissioners, &c., 1861, vol. iv. pp. 242-3.

rung itself, the way of ascent is more than possible; to industry and character it is freely open, and is seldom very difficult. At every step of advance, too, the collateral aids and accessories in the work of individual education, the education of the man and of the citizen, multiply and become more important, calling into play all the knowledge and all the faculty which each possesses. The education of the school introduces the scholar immediately to the further discipline and instruction of the shop, or factory, or office, or farm, or mine,—of the college or the studio; —meanwhile the whole life of the community, the daily and weekly press, parish questions, municipal controversies, general politics—the sessions, the assizes, the great courts of law, the elections, the business of Parliament—all that belongs to public affairs, to general trade, to the government of the country, whether imperial, or provincial, or local—all that belongs to the multitudinous energies and progress of the nation,—is contributing to the education of the rising English citizen.

Public business furnishes a very important part of the education of the Englishman, and has had much to do with the development of the national character; in the future it is not unlikely that its influence may yet be more important than in the past. It has been especially important in its effect upon the character of the middle and higher classes of British citizens. In strong contrast to Germany, perhaps still more to France, a genuine local self-government has schooled the Briton in those elementary lessons of political temper and self-control, of political instinct and principle, which have made it possible to govern our empire stably by the genuine power of public

opinion. Trial by jury may not have deserved, as an institution, all the eulogies which have been lavished upon it; but, at any rate, our institutions of justice have furnished an excellent training for our people in regard to public law and mutual civil responsibility. The county magistracy have not seldom betrayed ignorance, prejudice, and incapacity, and more or less, accordingly, have at times brought "justices' justice" into disrepute. Nevertheless, the institution of such a magistracy, maintained from age to age, has afforded most valuable instruction to country gentlemen in regard to the knowledge, the duties, and the responsibilities proper to their station, and has contributed not a little to compel their culture and advancement in the ideas belonging to their generation, and to keep them, as to social and political questions, from lagging too far behind the main current of the age. The Justices Shallow of the present age are doubtless a far superior class at all events to their prototypes of the Elizabethan period. Above all, the free and energetic parliamentary life of the nation, pervading all classes, penetrating to the very depths of society, has provided a most wholesome occupation for the energies of Englishmen. One great, prime reason of the vice and profligacy, the effeminate luxury and shameless sensual excesses, which, at all periods of settled commercial advancement and growing national wealth, of customary peace and of material prosperity, have disgraced the wealthy and fashionable society of France, whether under monarchy or empire, has been the want in that country of the true, civil self-government, and of the genuine political power and life which belong to the British nation. France cannot but become wealthy in times

of internal peace and general order—her incomparable natural riches and resources, and the many gifts of her spirited and ingenious people, ensure this. The climate of France, also, and the natural temperament of the people, overflowing with vivacity and buoyancy, incline to every kind of pleasure, and render various entertainment and play of life, in some sort or other, a necessity. What are such a people to take to, when they are debarred from self-government and from true political life? Municipal and general government and politics are at once the pastime and the business of Englishmen. Parliament is the heart and centre of English society, alike in town and country, in London and throughout all the provinces, in fashionable life, and in county circles, and in borough coteries and parties. Political life, speaking broadly, may be said to absorb the best energies of the most able and energetic Englishmen; it fills their thoughts, occupies their time, engages their keenest interest, lays a heavy tax on their strength and spirits, often on their health. If our men of wealth and leisure, of high mettle and exuberant spirits, were not able to occupy themselves with political life, into what channels would they pour their overflowing energies, and their strength and zest of passion and of will? It is no wonder that Frenchmen of wealth, and leisure, and high blood, are often vicious. What career of active engagement, suited to their position, is open to them? It is evident enough how much the political liberty and life of our own land has to do with the indisputably manlier and nobler character of our English gentlemen of high degree, as compared with the aristocracy either of France or of any other country. England's civil life and political

liberty have helped to make her men of high rank manly and capable, often truly noble and virtuous. Here, then, we have one of the most potent and beneficial elements of our national education.

From the thought of our national institutions, civil and political, of what belongs to the constitution and government of the country, including subordinate as well as imperial spheres of government, the transition is easy to the public press in all its branches, by means of which the civil and political education of the people is so largely aided, perhaps I should say, is mainly carried on. So far as the mere acquisition of knowledge is concerned, the press is the immediate supplement of the school. Without a large supply of cheap and attractive publications, and especially a cheap newspaper press, the instruction given in the elementary school would soon be forgotten, would fade quite out of the mind, in the case of the vast majority of scholars. Whereas, with good penny or halfpenny papers, and cheap and taking little books, a very defective school education may yet furnish an available introduction to a large and effective self-education. Who can doubt that the abolition of the taxes on knowledge in this country did more for the education of the people than any measure which had previously been enacted by Parliament? It is impossible to over-estimate the educational value of the "penny daily" in one direction, and of such illustrated penny papers as the *British Workman* in another. One great reason, doubtless, why in the United States, despite the very small tincture of schooling which the great majority of the people have ever acquired, and the generally defective organization of the schools, the mass of the people have grown up

reading and intelligent, smart and well informed, at least in regard to their own country, has been the universal diffusion for a great many years past of a very cheap newspaper literature. The halfpenny newspaper has been the schoolmaster of the American people. The halfpenny newspapers of Paris have helped not a little to make the Parisians what they are. The influence of a cheap press is prodigious, and may be as potent for evil as for good. But, in any case, it is a great educational force and agency. A truly national and noble, and at the same time a thoroughly free and practical, newspaper press for Germany—a press animated and sustained not only by the yearning for a grand national unity, but by all the instincts of true liberty, both civil and political, both imperial and local,—unfolding from the root and principle of personal freedom, and civil and political individuality, for each man,—would furnish, in great part, the effective educational supplement, which is so much needed, to the powerful and pervasive school system of Germany. But such a press can itself only grow out of the realities of national life; as yet national life in Germany is not free. In our own country the cheap press has become, and is becoming more and more, the chief elementary educator of the people, carrying on to great and permanent results the education begun in the school. We have reason to be deeply thankful that, on the whole, it is so good, so able and Christian, as it is. Those who know the Paris press will feel the truth of this. Nor will Englishmen feel any abatement of their thankfulness when they compare it with the American press. For dignity, propriety, purity, for thoroughness of knowledge, genuine power and ability, and for force

and finish of style, happily combined, no one will pretend that the American press is to be compared with that of Great Britain.

I have now but one more educational element in our national life on which I wish particularly to touch. The home, the street, the school, the craft or business or profession, the civil and political institutions of the country, the public press, especially the cheap newspaper, these are the means of education for the people which we have thus far passed in rapid review. There is one great section, however, of educational forces, of which as yet nothing has been said in detail,—I refer to the motives and incentives to providence and thrift which are likely to operate upon the poorest and lowliest of the people. It is evident that a large part of our English population stands in this respect greatly in need of education. The need in this respect is represented and summed up in one word—English pauperism.

English pauperism is a problem and a portent which seldom makes a due impression on an Englishman. It is a customary evil, and its monstrous character and dimensions are so familiar to us that they seldom strike us as monstrous. We take it as an unfortunate but seemingly inalienable part of our grand national inheritance, tarnishing in some degree its splendour, and, like a considerable charge on a vast hereditary property, diminishing to a certain extent the net value of our national estate; but it scarcely disturbs our self-complacency more than the national debt, of which we so easily pay the interest, and which appears to many, when regarded from a proper point of view, to be only one form and phase of our national wealth. There are those, indeed, who seem

to discover in our Poor Law system nothing but matter for self-congratulation. The pauperism they appear to regard as the inevitable concomitant of national and individual opulence, and of general freedom and progress; the poor-rate provision as the grand and noble benevolence of a Christian people. It does not seem to enter their minds that our widespread pauperism is fed from springs and tributaries which rise far back among the institutions of our country, and which, to a large extent, might be cut off or absorbed; and that the evil cannot be necessarily involved in national life and progress, because, in the character and extent in which it prevails in this country, it is absolutely a unique fact, because there is nothing comparable to it in the world besides. If, indeed, it were but the counterpart and concomitant of our vast material progress, we should have to come to the conclusion, that we must expect it to increase instead of diminishing in the future, which would indeed be a melancholy conclusion.

Unless, however, there be some possibility of applying a radically remedial course of treatment to this vast and complex evil, this ulcer in the body politic of our grand British empire, there can be no prospect but that of a continual increase of the evil. It is certain, also, that up to this time our legislation has never even attempted to grapple with the problem, as a whole, and one which was to be resolved in the sense of bringing pauperism, as the ordinary and hereditary condition of a large class of our population, to an end. Some valuable measures tending to the mitigation, and even in some degree to the diminution of pauperism, have been passed into law. The "Union Chargeability Act" was one of these. All

sanitary measures, moreover, such as that which was passed last year, tend in the same direction. These must have some value in preventing the increase and aggravation of pauperism. But what is needed is an investigation, searching and thorough, into the origin and the aggravating causes, as these have risen into operation from age to age, of this master-evil of our land, and a scheme of measures designed gradually to absorb the morbid and morbific accumulation of pauperism which has come down to us in the present generation, to reverse the pauper tendencies which have become hereditary instincts among a large proportion of the population, and to provide for the permanent elevation into a different position and character of the lowest classes of our countrymen. Such an investigation as I have now spoken of has never been undertaken by Parliament; nor has any scheme of legislation for the cure of pauperism been brought forward by any government. No offer has been made to go to the root of the mischief. We go on, at a charge of millions a year for mere poor-rates, not to speak of our enormous expenditure for criminal prosecution and prison discipline and maintenance,—which is largely caused by our pauperism,—merely providing reservoirs for the deep and wide overflow, and contrivances to regulate its influx or outflow, but doing little or nothing to check it at its fountain and absorb it in its course. What makes matters worse, the very provision which we make at present for the wants of our pauper population tends to aggravate that desperate recklessness from which, in part, our pauperism springs.*

* The pauperism of England has increased in its proportions during the last five-and-thirty years, notwithstanding the enormously increased

It is vain to hope that school education will bring pauperism to an end. On the contrary, pauperism will, to a very large extent, neutralise the operation and influences of our elementary schools. It is abundantly proved that, so long as the hereditary pauper child remains in its own family, no schooling, in the great majority of cases, will avail to take out the pauper taint. The education and influences of the miserable "home" nullify those of the school. Pauperism, more or less, infects with the taint of its unmanly and servile spirit, its abject helplessness, an immense proportion of our agricultural labouring class, and a very considerable proportion of our town operatives, including often those who are in receipt of good wages. The pauper taint in any family is an antagonist force to the influence of the school, which school teaching and training, however excellent, can hardly vanquish. Nor is it only the pauper taint of spirit. There is the internal disorganization of the pauper home. Abjectness and recklessness, compounded in various degrees, are the main element of the pauper spirit. The family in which these influences prevail is not only always a poor, but a wretchedly ordered, family. Cleanliness, decency, and order, can scarcely survive in the pauper cottage. Reckless improvidence, or abject dependence, must, in either case, mean misery and demoralisation.

It must be borne in mind, moreover, that there

wealth and prosperity of the country, all improvements in administration, and a very considerable spread of education among the working classes. The number of persons annually in receipt of pauper relief is upwards of a million. The annual cost of poor relief is £7,886,724. The rate of levy on the entire population of the country in 1868 and 1870 was 6*s.* 11½*d.*, and in 1871 was 6*s.* 11¼*d.*; this being the highest proportion of charge in these three cases known since the New Poor Law was brought into full operation in 1836.

appears to be no likelihood whatever that the children of the pauper and semi-pauper classes can be kept to school like the children of the better classes. Experience in London teaches thus far what was foretold by men who knew the classes in question, that compulsion can only be partially brought to bear on them. It is found necessary, in such cases, when they are got hold of, to allow the children to attend only half-time, earning what they can the other half, and sometimes the school half-time is partly made up in the very unsatisfactory mode, especially for young children, of evening instruction. Of many of these children, with all its resolute endeavours and steady working, and with all the diligence of its visitors, the School Board has never got hold at all. The number of children still in the streets, day by day, is not, in the worst districts, greatly diminished. When seized for a moment these classes, whether parents or children, are as hard to hold as an eel. Besides which, the compulsory provisions possible under the Education Act are, if made the most and the best of, exceedingly inadequate. Only in few cases comparatively is it possible to secure the conviction of negligent or recalcitrant parents. Many of the meshes in the School Board's net are very wide and loose. The law of evidence makes conviction difficult; some of the magistrates refuse to convict; there are none who like the responsibility which the Act devolves upon them. At present, in short, no way has been discovered of taking effectual dealing, in the great majority of cases, with the semi-pauper and semi-criminal classes on whose account legal prosecution is most needed. Meanwhile, these shifty and migratory classes become more cunning week by

week, are becoming more perfect in their "dodges," and better acquainted with the weak places of the Act. In London, accordingly—and the same thing must be true to a large, if not to the full, extent of the like classes in all our large towns—the Education Act does not appear likely to secure the full and regular school attendance of the classes on whose behalf, most of all, compulsion has been invoked. There has been a considerable increase, no doubt, in general school attendance; but this increase has been least where it was most needed. School education alone could never reclaim from pauperism the pauper or semi-pauper classes of our large towns. But, if it could, it cannot, in the case of these classes, be adequately applied.

If this is true as to town pauperism, it is not less true of the pauper or semi-pauper population of our agricultural districts. No one, indeed, as yet has furnished us with a scheme for compulsory education in agricultural districts which promises to be in any fair degree effective. All appear to be agreed that compulsion in agricultural districts must proceed upon a half-time principle, but how to apply the principle, so as to cover the ground fairly, to meet the necessities of farm labour, and to secure any effective tincture of education for the children, is a point on which opinions are widely divided, and no one seems to have a proposal likely to command general confidence. Practical men will not look to school education for the cure of agricultural pauperism. An effective school education cannot be given to the children of agricultural paupers or semi-paupers, unless they are taken quite away from home. If such an education could be given to the child

remaining at home, it would in most instances avail little to redeem the child from the influences which surround him. Some little better he might be through life. In a rare case he might even force his way upward. This, however, would be the remarkable exception. He would be more likely to be made discontented and unhappy, without any means to remove his discontent; having his lot the bitterer, but not the better. There is at present, however, not much fear of a semi-pauper labourer's child being educated well enough to add poignancy to the sadness of his life as it is, by the refinement which even a tincture of genuine education gives to the sensibilities, rendering humiliation and abject dependence more grievous and bitter.

If the better classes realised what the condition of the semi-pauper classes is, they would immediately feel how incompatible such a condition is with any proper training and up-bringing of children. There are, no doubt, two classes of the pauperised, those who are so by the necessity of their position, and those who are so through their own vice and improvidence. The prevalence of the second sort in our large towns is largely due to the necessary and widely diffused existence of the former class in our agricultural districts. Let me describe the village labourer who lives always on the verge of pauperism.

His cottage has been often described of late years in Parliamentary Blue Books and by newspaper correspondents. It is likely to consist of three rooms. It is occupied by a family which includes children of various ages, often among them adolescent lads and lasses, not seldom also a grown-up male lodger; the

common room is filled with litter and discomfort; the two bedrooms have to suffice for all the inmates, younger and older, and of both sexes; delicacy or neatness—nay, often decency—is precluded in the inner arrangements of the cottage, or in the habits of the inmates; of course, there no *home* can be found for husband, or rising lad, or lodger. Neither, under such circumstances, can the dispirited and hard-worn wife retain, even if she had once acquired, perhaps at service in some decent family, habits of neatness and self-respect. She can have little love for her cottage, and can take no honest pride in it, as her neat and cherished home, well kept and not unadorned. Perhaps she had once dreamt of owning such a home: but if so, the hard reality has painfully dissipated her dream. Too often, indeed, the case is even worse than this, and the cottage is a wretched double cell, where penury cowers, and where chastity and decency can hardly survive. Domestic tenderness can scarcely bloom in such an atmosphere. Female delicacy must be unknown. It is impossible that the richly clustering family affections can be developed in due Christian, or even, in a just sense, in true human proportions. The house is to all the family nothing more than a needful but unlovely place of shelter; with hardly a comfort, with hardly an ornament, full of cumber, litter, and care. Such are the homes of the majority of our English peasantry in the southern, western, and south-midland districts, and of many in most parts of England. Such also are the cottages of the labouring poor in wide districts of Scotland and in many parts of Wales.

The peasant who inhabits such abodes is in cha-

racter with them. He is not, as poets and theorists have painted, England's glory, but her reproach; the nursling of the parish, the dependant of the squire; brought into the world by the parish doctor, pensioned in old age or sickness on parish pay,—or, if his lot be still more hapless, destined to seek his refuge in the Union House,—and buried in a parish coffin.

Such is the condition of the pauperised peasant. It is evident that something besides school education is needed to transform into Christian comfort and self-respect the condition of those who live as I have described. It must be remembered that it is a condition out of which the southern peasant is unable to redeem himself. Suppose, for instance, he should be so superior in character to his breeding and surroundings as to be prepared to deny himself and save money,—I will not say after his marriage, for that would be manifestly impossible to the labourer who does not earn more the year round than nine shillings on an average,—but before his marriage. Suppose his resolution and self-denial were such that, from the time he was sixteen till he was five-and-twenty, he were, as a single man, to put by all that, by the utmost economy and temperance, he could save. How much would it amount to, and what good would it do him, as things now are? By the help of the Post-Office Savings-bank it is within the range of possibility, that so virtuous and resolute a young man might, within the period I have named, get together £50. But what then? What will such an amount do for him? As a village labourer, a small retail business is for him out of the question, for many reasons. Fifty pounds will not help him

to a farm of any sort or size, even if he could manage a farm. The natural thing would be for him to buy a piece of land with his savings, and fifty pounds ought to pay well for half an acre of the best land. Such a piece of land, if he could get it, would be worth to him in mere money value several shillings a week, in some instances would bring him in an addition of thirty or forty per cent. to his wages. In other ways, it would be still more valuable. It would be by far the most profitable of savings-banks to him, for he would put into it all his spare labour, every hour or half-hour he could find in which to work upon it; it would in this way pay him the largest possible interest and compound interest. It would keep him from the public-house. It would raise him to the stature and consciousness of a man and a citizen. It would make him sedulously thrifty, and hopefully provident. But then with his fifty pounds the labourer cannot buy any land. The landlord is not at liberty, he says, to sell away the land. If he were, and would sell, the cost of title and conveyance would swallow up a large proportion of the purchase-money. The only thing, in the vast majority of cases, which the young man could do with his money when he had saved it, and before he married, would be to bank it or safely invest it. Its interest might perhaps yield him ninepence a week.

Such is the money value of the inducement to save out of his wages as much as he can, and to postpone marriage to a comparatively mature age, which can at present be held out to the working lad who is rising towards manhood. Is it likely to be effective, likely to operate upon the well-disposed lad of

seventeen, or even of eighteen, and to lead him to begin to save betimes, which would be his only chance of rising under the most favourable agricultural conditions? It is plain enough that such a prospect will have no influence. Why should the lad deprive himself of pleasure, variety, some play of indulgence and enjoyment, in the only period of his life in which he will ever be able to command a little spare money for any such purpose? Youth must have some fairer offer, if it is to deny itself with close constancy, and to forego its brief fling of energy and life. If independence in the future, "the magic of property," a garden plot of his own, with by-and-by a house upon it, castled in which he might defy the fell alternative of the Union House, if such possibilities as these rose as a vision of hope before the eye of the young peasant, many is the lad who, for such prizes, would toil, and save, and remain a single, saving labourer for years, but not for the prospect, after eight or nine years' labour, of fifty pounds in a bank yielding interest at two or three per cent. What is wanting to cherish and develop in the character of the young labourer providence and self-control, the best and most essential parts of education, is, besides the basis of intelligent instruction and training in the elementary school, the after-education afforded by the prizes and incentives of life, hope and motive suitable to his position, and adequate to sustain through the needful course of exertion and self-denial.

But the case is even worse than this. There is not only no adequate inducement for the exercise of saving self-denial and of special exertion in early years to ensure an adequate provision in later, but

in fact the inducement lies in the contrary direction. The youth marries early, probably before he is twenty, on calculation and for reasons which in his situation are good and sound. What is to become of him when he is old, if he has any children not able to work for themselves, and if he has not some one at least among his children, son or married daughter, with whom he and his wife can live? In such a case, there would be no resort for him and his wife but the Union House with the wall between them. The English labourer would be far more obtuse and degraded than he is if he did not, with all his soul, hate and dread the thought of this. When he is sixty he will probably be crazed with rheumatism, and no longer able to work. His cottage he will have to leave, in order to make way for an able-bodied labourer who will take his work. Well for him if at that time he has no child still dependent; if he can live with his youngest boy or girl then beginning to keep house; if his youngest son can step at once into the father's work and cottage, and there should be no need to turn the old man from the door. It is of no use, under existing conditions of English agricultural society, to declaim against early marriages. Early marriage is the labourer's best insurance against a pauper's place in the "Union" at last. An English peasant, as things are, does more wisely to marry early than to postpone his marriage till he is nearer thirty than twenty, that he may save. He marries; he sets himself to bear his lot, as his fathers have done, with a passive manliness, always more or less sad when it is not sullen. But of saving or bettering his condition it is impossible that he should dream, in his position and

with his wages. His utmost ambition is limited to seeing his children fairly married, and to evading "the House." Education has small chance in such a condition of things. School education can effect very little indeed against such odds. Any attempt to carry it beyond the simplest elements seems almost to be a satire and a cruelty.

I do not write these words in bitterness, but in sad simplicity of truth-telling. The farmers are not to blame for the general condition of things of which I speak, any more than the labourer himself. The general result is the effect of causes which have been operating through centuries past. Farmers pay as high wages in proportion to profit made as other men—higher, perhaps, than most men. Few of them get more than seven or eight per cent. profit on their working capital. Well invested, their capital might easily yield them five per cent., or even more, if they went out of business altogether. Landlords, again, have certainly not, as a class—especially the hereditary landlords of England—rack-rented their land; although, doubtless, as men of wealth, culture, rank, and high responsibility, they ought to have known the actual condition of the labourers on their estates as they do not seem generally to have known it, and ought to have laid it to heart, until, at whatever cost to class prejudices or interests, the sore and corrosive evils of which I have spoken, and which, after all, I have but lightly painted, were brought to an end. But the apathy and acquiescence of landlords has only been the counterpart of similar apathy and acquiescence in the case of grievous social wrongs and sufferings on the part of all classes whose interests have appeared to be inseparable from the

maintenance of such wrongs. No English class of proprietors or employers has the right, in regard to such matters, to cast stones against another. It is needful, nevertheless, that all such wrongs and sufferings should be exposed and redressed, whatever may be the prejudices and interests of those classes who have been mixed up with their existence and perpetuation.

Canon Girdlestone, so well known as the friend of the agricultural labourer, thinks that all these wrongs will get righted through the process of migration. I cannot myself think so. That migration will do good, I have no doubt. By the migration of labourers, on the one hand, farmers will be compelled to give higher wages, by the scientific employment of the best manures and the best machinery to the utmost extent possible they will be enabled to do this. This will gradually come about to some extent, and will be a great gain. Just in proportion as this happens, it will become necessary for the field labourer to be a more educated man, capable of directing machinery, and of understanding also somewhat of the elements of agricultural chemistry as applied to the land. The superior servants of the farm will thus be men of educated minds, worth high wages, and who will demand and obtain proper cottages to live in. Ultimately, no doubt, things will work more or less in this direction, and it is encouraging to have such a prospect rising into view. But the process, on the whole, will be very, very slow. It depends largely on the extent to which migration can be carried. Experience shows that our agricultural population, like all such populations, is very slow indeed to move. Forty years ago great efforts were made for

some time in connection with the Poor-Law Department, and aided by the private zeal and help of some benevolent employers of labour in the north, chiefly, I believe, members of the Society of Friends, to promote a systematic migration of labouring families from the southern counties of England to the textile manufacturing districts of the north. But it produced little result. It is true that, as education advances, removal to a distance becomes a less formidable idea to the inert, bucolic mind. Nevertheless, the repugnance to move will still remain solid and strong, a deeply rooted and not unbeautiful instinct. What is wanted is to change the broad face of England, in its south-midland, southern, and western provinces, in the respect of which I have spoken. Attempts to promote migration, dependent as these are on individual effort, will but produce a sensation and movement here and there. The process of migration, left alone, will require generations to work out the desired result. Meantime the case presses, tens of thousands are born and die, and an agitation has begun which may before long assume a very formidable character. There should be some better, more direct, more benevolent and equitable, and more statesmanlike plan of dealing with such evils as I have described, than merely to wait and see what migration will do for the peasantry of England. At this rate, it will be long before they are changed into an educated, hopeful, and manly race.

The one sure cure of pauperism, especially of rural pauperism, is to bring the labouring man into such a position that, by frugality and industry, he may live in his own cottage. Then, when his working days

are over, he will remain under his own roof, instead of being obliged to betake himself to the "Union," and, by reserving to himself the good single room which may be all that his wife and himself require, and letting the rest of the cottage, perhaps to one of his children, or to some comfortable young pair, at their starting in life, he will at least be insured against starvation as well as homelessness. Such resources as these, and a trifle of help from his "club," would secure the comfort to the last of the prudent and industrious working man. Briefly stated, then, this is the problem—to make it fairly possible for the working man to become the owner of his own cottage, and, along with this, in country districts, for reasons which I have already indicated, of a plot of land. Half an acre would be an ample allowance; a rood might in many cases be enough. If the way to this were made plain, the way would be open to the extinction of English pauperism. England would then become as our Channel Islands are. It would be necessary, however, to take strict precautions as to the adequacy of the accommodation, and as to the sanitary provisions of the cottage to begin with. Otherwise, many working men would build worse cottages than the worst which have ever been built for them. At the same time it is intolerable that, as is the case at present, a man with a large grown-up family should be prohibited, even if he has the means and will, from adding to his cottage such accommodation as mere decency demands, and should be absolutely dependent on the will of his landlords. In not a few of our large towns, by the help of building land societies, the working classes are now very extensively providing themselves with houses of their

own. Just in proportion as this is prudently accomplished, pauperism becomes barred out. In Birmingham, Leeds, many Staffordshire towns, and not a few of the towns of Lancashire, this work has already been largely carried out. No more powerful educational movement could be prosecuted. But building land societies cannot be organized, as matters now stand, for our country villages.

I have spoken hitherto almost exclusively of agricultural pauperism. This, indeed, is the root-pauperism of the country. The pauperism of the towns has been mainly bred from this. Moreover, this is a pauperism made for the peasant, and not contracted by him. Vice and profligacy breed pauperism in towns; pauperism also propagates itself, by reason of its hereditary instincts. From these sources chiefly the pauperism of towns is derived. But the conditions of the agricultural peasant's life make him necessarily a semi-pauper, and keep him continually on the edge of complete pauperism, with the workhouse always in view as the natural and legitimate termination of his earthly existence. And this pauperism of the country, as I have intimated—the pauper scions of the country and the pauper temper derived from the country—this produces the bloated and reckless pauperism of the town. When the countryman is transplanted as an operative to the town, and finds himself furnished with the large wages, and at the same time surrounded by the potent temptations of the town, his helpless pauper nature falls a victim to town debauchery; sensual, undisciplined, improvident, he becomes besotted with a deeper and grosser overflow of drunkenness and profligacy.

There is hope that the pauperism of our towns may by proper treatment be absorbed; that of our agricultural districts is constitutional; it is one of the institutions of our country—a necessary part of the social fabric, as at present organized. In our towns, although the homes of the working people may sometimes be even worse than in ancient and unreformed country villages, and although temptations to vice abound on every side, yet at the same time many modes of employment, such as promise independence and advance in life, attract in all directions. The educated or half-educated boy, even of wastrel parents, has at least a chance of rising into a different sphere. It is far otherwise in the country village. Besides which, the vicious classes in towns tend, after all, to self-extinction. If they were not continually reinforced in number by those who come in fresh from the country, or who sink through vice into degradation from respectability, they would presently, by mere force of riot and corruption, waste away to nothing. Whereas the pauperism of the country, degraded but not riotously profligate, tutored into a certain propriety of conduct, too poor to run deep into excess, and kept in careful preservation by means of charity and poor relief, is an institution which has existed for generations, if not for centuries, and is not likely to perish from any internal causes. This, therefore, is the master evil to be dealt with.

It is true, notwithstanding, as a matter of fact, although not as a necessary part of our present town organization, that pauperism is both largely aggravated and extensively propagated in some of our great cities by reason of the actual condition, in particular, of the wretched places in which they live. Professor

Huxley declared not long ago in the London School Board that he had never seen such wretchedness and barbarism in the heathen tribes with which he had made acquaintance as on his visits as a professional man to certain parts of London. A large proportion of the London labouring classes live in a single room. Sometimes two or even more families occupy the same room. This terrible evil is partly, of course, the consequence of vice and improvidence. But to a considerable extent it arises out of the entire want in London of cottage home provision for the labouring poor, and the excessive dearness of lodging rooms. However the evil may have originated, there can be no doubt as to its deplorable character, and the fearful infection of moral and social corruption which it breeds. It cries loudly for remedy, at whatever cost of convenience to individuals, or of expenditure to the general public. The like evil is found also in Edinburgh and Glasgow. In Liverpool, also, the Irish quarter is very full of miserable crowded rooms, including cellars, in which families are housed. In Manchester matters are much better, owing largely to improved municipal administration. In the smaller towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire the labouring classes, as a rule, are excellently housed. Building societies have done very much in the Northern and North Midland counties, and particularly among larger towns, in Birmingham and Leeds, to bring about this improved condition of things. If London could be made in this respect as the large towns of the North, the work of the School Board would be much lighter.

I have already tried to show the disheartening and demoralising effect of the cottage hovel

on the inmates. The influence of the lodging-room housing on the crowded families of our large towns is still worse. The houses in which these rooms are let as separate tenements are generally situated in the lowest and most unhealthy parts of the town—often in foul slums and alleys. In such abodes families litter together in dirt and wretchedness. Of course there is no *home* there to any of the family. When the day's work is done it is not be expected that the man at least should stay "at home." They have nothing for it then but to go to the only room with anything like warmth and comfort in it that is accessible to them—*i.e.* to the room at the public-house. What are to be the "pleasures," the refreshments, the recreations, of the man who is so lodged? He can hardly be expected to seek for moral or intellectual enjoyment. He naturally betakes himself to such low physical pleasures as he can command.

Nor is this all. Sleeping in fetid poisonous air, man, wife, and children together, in a room never ventilated, and in a region where pure air is scarcely to be had, the labourer's blood is debased, his spirits depressed, his appetite and digestion impaired, his whole frame enfeebled. How is his languor to be stimulated, his depression to be relieved, his flagging strength to be spurred to exertion? He knows but of one specific, and that is drink. It is too plain for any earnest philanthropist to deny it. It is proclaimed not only by Canon Kingsley, but by Lord Shaftesbury, that the drunkenness of the lowest classes of the people depends mainly on the quality of their homes. If they are to be reformed as a class from the vice of drunkenness, their social condition and circumstances

must be amended. This is a reform which must proceed, *pari passu*, with reduction of the number and limitation of the hours of public-houses and liquor-shops. It is vain to insist on the latter while neglecting the former. Mere measures of repression must be ineffectual. It is indeed necessary to remove the incentives and opportunities which tempt the poor man to drunkenness and vice. But they who insist on this are bound first of all to insist that the poor man shall have the terrible obstacles removed which lie in his way to virtue, and home affections, and self-respect. Without effective sanitary and social reforms, such as shall make proper homes for our operative population obtainable in suitable situations, and at possible rents, it is impossible for our low town masses to be redeemed or elevated. The housing ruins all.

It is not my business to point out the remedies for the evils of which I speak. I desire to show distinctly what the evils are, and how they environ the problem and work of national education. In particular I wish to show how impossible it is, in such a condition of things, to effect the real work of national education merely by means of day schools for the children. Day-school education cannot be effectively applied under such circumstances to the very classes which most of all need to be educated, and cannot contend against such influences. Whatever effect it produces on the children who are really brought, more or less, to school, must, in the majority of cases, be but transient, and cannot well in any case be adequate. Least of all could a merely secular education produce the requisite impression. In this case moral training is the first want. Such training

cannot, indeed, be impressed except in connection with intellectual information and discipline. But, on the other hand, intellectual discipline and instruction can hardly be imparted in such circumstances except by the aid of moral influence. If it could, it would be a very dangerous remedy to offer. A merely secular education, imparted to the children of the classes I have described, would indeed be often worse than nothing. It would train in London a worse than Parisian *prolétaire* community. Moral and religious influence is an absolute necessity in the education of such classes. Such influence cannot possibly emanate from the "homes" of the parents, or from any source outside the school. The classes of which I speak cannot be "compelled" to take their children to public worship, or to send them either to church or to Sunday school. The conclusion which seems to follow from all that has passed in review is that to dream of effecting the end of national education, truly so called, merely by means of elementary day schools is but a delusive dream; that if the schools were simply and purely secular, the worst classes would be as likely to be made worse as better by their school education, while even Christian day schools could only, at the best, and at the most, furnish one element—truly a very valuable element—out of the many which must combine in order to bring about, in any true and adequate sense, the national education of the country. To prevent grievous disappointment and mischievous reaction—a reaction which would bring school education altogether into neglect—to indicate the right direction of national effort, and to show the necessity of supplementing by measures of social reform the present laudable

and zealous attempts at educational extension, I have wished to call attention to the points on which I have been dwelling.

A word must be added, notwithstanding, as to the real and very great value, and at this time for England the pressing necessity, of an effective and pervasive system of elementary school education. It is true that such education is but one among many elements, all essential, and some to the full as important as itself, which must be combined in order to have an educated people. But it must not be forgotten that it is an element that is especially and pre-eminently necessary in the case of a nation of which a large proportion consists of a sunken, serf-like class, and another large proportion of a reckless, profligate class. It is true that the United States afford an instance of an intelligent, prosperous, and, regarded as a nation of men and women, an educated people, whose school education has been imperfect. But then two things must be remembered. The first is that in the States, apart from the dregs of two or three large towns, there is no sunken, semi-pauperised class whatever; all the people are in the condition, and have from the first been in the condition, of our middle and lower-middle classes. The skilled artisan in the States, as a rule, owns his own house. It is a nation of proprietors. Pauperism, in England a legacy from mediæval times and dregs of an outworn feudalism, has never been known in the States. Settled by intelligent and energetic emigrants from our own country, and from all the countries of Europe, except the south Latin nations of the Continent; impregnated from its early beginnings with the energetic and self-reliant spirit of the

most resolute English Puritans and Cavaliers; endowed with boundless wealth of the richest land, so that the whole people could obtain each one a share in that grand landed inheritance; receiving but few immigrants, even from Ireland, who did not bring with them some means, and a spirit far above pauperism; able to absorb into its service as hewers of wood and drawers of water, all, and more than all, of an inferior sort, who, being mostly Irish or German, have come to its shores;—the case of America as to education offers no parallel, but in all respects a contrast to that of England. The States have no English village population; nor are there, or have there ever been, to be found in the States improvident masses of uneducated operatives. The United States boy grows up in the family of an eager, smart, intelligent citizen. His home furnishes him, in good part, with his education. Let him but learn at school the rudiments of a very plain education, and he will not fail to become a reader of the news, a dealer, and a politician. The people of the States, like our English middle classes, and as was to be expected of a people so constituted, and so descended, are almost universally a church-going people. The Sunday school is a universal and most favourite institution among them. The children learn little at day school in the way of Christian instruction, although they do nearly always learn something, but they all attend church and Sunday school. All this is most important in its bearing upon our present subject, and this is the first particular of contrast with England which it is necessary to bear in mind. The other is, that although the American schools may be imperfectly organized as a rule, and often attended by the scholars not many days in the

year, yet the institution of the "common school" has availed at least to bring some rudimentary schooling within reach of all. Education is neither so good nor so universal in the States as has been imagined in this country, but still the vast majority of the people can at least read fairly, and write a little, and know sufficient arithmetic to do their own business smartly and well.

From all which it follows that, because an inferior, and on the whole, according to our standard, an ineffective school provision may serve passably well for the people of the States, we have no reason therefore to conclude that an imperfect and ineffective system will meet the needs of England. We have whole classes to raise from the verge of pauperism. We need, it is true, something above and beyond the education of the school; we need the means of taking hold of the boy who has left school, and lifting him above the sphere of pauperism, or at least to be able to offer him the means, and show him the way, to redeem and elevate himself. But in order to enable him to appreciate the opportunity when it arises, and to avail himself of it, his mind and faculties must be awakened at school. The pauper apathy and torpor must be taught and trained out of him; the influences of his home must, as far as possible, be neutralised; hope, activity, a just and laudable ambition, a manly spirit and self-reliance, must be elicited and developed. Instead of the pauper maxims and prejudices which are the hereditary code of wisdom for all his class, the maxims and principles of true social wisdom and morality—nowhere and by no teacher so to be taught as by our Lord and His apostle Paul—must be instilled into his mind. The harder

the work which is to be done, the more effective ought to be the education by which, in the case of the English child, the foundation of the whole work of redemption and elevation is to be laid. Our school education alone can lay this foundation. It is but a foundation, but without the foundation there cannot even be a beginning of the work. The foundation must be good, or the work will be nought. Amateur teachers may be a sufficient makeshift for the country towns of the United States; but skilled teachers, thoroughly trained, alone can do the needful work for England.

Besides which, England is a manufacturing country, whereas as yet there is but little manufacturing industry in the States. As a manufacturing country, England is brought into competition with all the manufacturing populations of Europe. The skilled workmen of England for want of adequate education are in some danger, at least in certain departments, of being outrivalled by the more educated workmen of Germany and Switzerland. Where intellectual training and habits of minute, and as it were mathematical, accuracy are necessary, the Continental workman often excels the English; as, for instance, in the watch-making business. So too in all artistic work English taste needs to be sedulously cultivated, if it is to rival the taste of the French or the Swiss workman. For these reasons a superior elementary education, opening the way to suitable technical education, where such education is appropriate, is undoubtedly a necessity for our England of to-day. The ideal aim should be so to touch and waken, so to elicit and develop the faculties of every child, that he may have the opportunity of finding his fit place in

life, and of being thoroughly fitted for it. These, however, are now our commonplaces as educationists, and I need not dwell further on such points as these.

I have said little in this chapter about the influence of Christian truth and teaching as one of the great factors of national education—as, in a true sense, by far the greatest factor of all. It will be remembered, however, that I have not left it out of account at the point where the influence of Christian truth and training was evidently and especially needed. But I have a specific object in view, and there is no need that I should here attempt to argue what my readers, for the most part, will assume throughout, that the best inspiration, and by far the most commanding forces, in the education of the modern world, have been derived from Christianity. It is more to my purpose to point out that Christianity cannot even be brought into contact with a large proportion of the people of England—is scarcely less aloof from them, and is shut away from them by a much more invincible barrier, than from the outlying heathen—so long as they remain surrounded by the hostile, anti-Christian, demoralising causes and conditions of things which determine at present their social position. I must repeat what I said at the beginning of this chapter. The home, the street, the workshop, the pit and factory, the stakes and prizes of life, cheap newspapers and periodicals, the laws and institutions of the country—these, and not schools and churches only, or even chiefly—form the effectual means and incentives of our national education ; *these* train up the men and women, the citizens and parents of our land. The school and pulpit have done much

in the past, and will do more in the future. But the same principle which leads Christians to insist that the pulpit is not sufficient for national education, nor even the pulpit and the Sunday-school together, but that the daily school must be a place of Christian education, because it is the daily school, should lead Christians also to understand that the social and business sphere in which parents and children alike continually live, and which is, in a yet deeper, truer, more emphatic sense, their daily school, needs to be penetrated with Christian influences, if the people are to grow up Christian. How great are the multitudes who come very slightly and irregularly, if at all, within the range of Christian school training; while still larger numbers never go near church or chapel, after, as children, they have been released from attendance as Sunday scholars. Christianity cannot get at the people it most wants to reach, except through the avenue of social philanthropy and active equity and aid. It is emphatically true to its Divine Original when it prepares the way for spiritual influence by means of temporal aid and social sympathy and fellowship. Unless our national Christianity can prevail to reach those social habits and institutions, those civil or political conditions, and those moral influences which have combined to give form and character to the operative commonalty of England, its great work must be left to a great extent undone. If Jesus had been a Christ who never healed the sick, or ate with the publican, but merely preached self-denial and spiritual truth, rebuking and dining with the Pharisee, and taking sweet but separate counsel with his disciples, He would neither have

suffered on the cross, nor have been the Saviour of the world. School education, then, is a great thing, and an absolutely needful thing; it must occupy its place as one of the most potent among many co-ordinate and co-operative agencies for the elevation of the nation; it is second in importance to none except home influence; it is the foundation on which all the work of elevating the pauperised classes must be built. But yet, single-handed, it cannot accomplish all, nor indeed very much. If condemned by a stagnant policy in matters of sanitary, social, and economical legislation to remain alone, it must be comparatively powerless and valueless. It cannot in reality be applied in a large proportion of cases; and, if it were applied, its efficiency would be largely neutralised.

CHAPTER II.

EDUCATION AND PROPERTY.

IN order that a generation of children may grow up into well-educated men and citizens, it is necessary, as the last chapter has shown us, that they should receive a good and thorough school education; that there should be ready to their hand, on leaving school and afterwards, cheap and suitable reading; that motives and opportunities to providence and to self-culture should come distinctly into their sight as soon as they begin to work for wages, if not before; and that their home, both in childhood and youth, should be with provident, reflective persons—persons who, whether they have had more or less school education, are yet of an educated mind and character. Given these conditions, and the children are certain, as a class, to grow up well educated, in possession of adequate knowledge, and of a thoughtful and provident character.

Of these conditions the school element may be, and no doubt soon will be, well provided for English children of the working class, so far as teachers, premises, and organization go, and the cheap and suitable literature is also provided. But the other conditions are not less essential. How are these

to be ensured? to be ensured, in particular, for the working-class parents of England, that being the class whose educational condition is now in question?

If the parents all had permanent properties of their own, or a fair prospect of acquiring such properties, and if the children had before them from the first the prospect, by steady diligence and by saving thrift, of acquiring property for themselves, the problem that now perplexes us would be solved. The self-same condition which would cure pauperism, as already shown, would also ensure all the needful educating influences for the child as schoolboy, as at work for boy's day wages, and as young working man. Nor should this be deemed an impossible, or a Utopian, or in the least an improbable solution, seeing that the problem has already been solved precisely in the manner indicated in most of the countries of Europe—in Scandinavia, in Germany, in the Low Countries, in Switzerland, in France, and in our own Channel Islands. I do not mean to say that the people of these countries are not poor, but only that they are not pauperised; nor do I mean that they are all of them well instructed in school knowledge—many of the French peasantry have not been able, in their hard, poor life, and with the inadequacy of the national provision for education, either to get such schooling themselves or to give it their children; but I mean that they have a fairly educated character, that they are provident, reflective, self-controlled, very saving, and very anxious for the rise and advance of their children, both by schooling, if the opportunity is to be had, and otherwise. Often the educational school standard of such people is very low, comprehending but the simplest rudiments,

limited in proportion to their own knowledge and the narrowness of their horizon in life; but yet they greatly value education for their children, so far as they can enter into its scope and meaning, and (here is the great point) they are prepared to exercise great self-denial themselves in order that their children may obtain such a rudimentary education at school as may help them to fill up efficiently their place in life, and not improbably to rise beyond their parents in position. In all the countries to which I have referred, peasants, as a class, either have property, real property, or have the hope of acquiring it, and every young peasant grows up with such hopes and prospects before him. It is true that, after all, the French peasant is commonly poor, often poorer even than the Dorsetshire labourer, owing no doubt, in great part, to the excessive subdivision of the land in France, but owing also to other and general causes which have affected the entire condition of the country, and made it in many ways less wealthy and prosperous, notwithstanding its natural riches, than our own land. But the greater the poverty of the French peasantry—or any other proprietary peasantry which may be pointed to as actually poorer than the English agricultural population—the greater the wonder that, notwithstanding, they are not pauperised, that they are frugal and self-respecting, and that they contrive to live, not seldom even to save, on their miserable means; the more emphatic the lesson which it affords as to the possibility, under a different social economy, of effecting a radical cure of the pauperism of England, and having a race of peasantry, themselves of educated mind and character, and valuing education for their children—children

who, in their turn, would grow up in the midst of influences and incentives favourable to thoughtfulness and thrift.

Professional men have educated minds, and value education in their children, whether possessed or not of any real property themselves; in part because they belong to a class in which education has become hereditary, and in part because of the high and special education which they have themselves received. The same principle applies, to a considerable extent, in the case of skilled mechanics of the highest class. Their continuous education as mechanics or artisans, lasting through many years, trains them often, trains the best of them, into men of powerful thought and altogether superior culture. To the shopkeeper his business is property, real property to him, and the conduct of a business is, to man or woman, eminently an education, exercising not a few of the most valuable faculties of the mind—forethought, judgment, saving and self-restraint, enterprise also and decision. These classes, accordingly, are certain to value education for their children, in so far as they can appreciate its scope; their children also will be surrounded at home by educative influences and incentives. But if the ignorant and more or less pauperised labouring classes are to be educated and elevated increasingly from generation to generation—for the work must have a comparatively rude beginning, and cannot be brought to completeness all at once—I have never been able to read or hear of any other way by which it is to be accomplished but that which I have been trying to indicate.

By opening to the working classes the fairly ready means of acquiring property, three things would

be accomplished at the same time. They would come to care themselves for the education of their children, a result which would solve the at present impracticable problem of educational compulsion. There would be opened to the young peasant a hope and prospect which would call forth his latent energies, and tend to complete for him the education begun at school, cherishing the best elements of his character, so as to make of him a prudent, manly, self-reliant, well-informed citizen. A counterpoise would be supplied, sitting close to the very centre of national oscillation and disturbance, against the rising rush and swing of oppidan and (still worse) of agrarian communism, which is otherwise likely to threaten all the liberties and the whole prosperity of England. On the Continent the peasantry are the ground-stay of the social fabric, the chief guarantee of property and of order. But then the peasantry on the Continent are not paupers or pauperised; they are, as a class, proprietors.

Let me protest beforehand against the rising misconception of some of my readers, and declare that I mean no such thing, in what I have been writing, as any equal division of land, or the abolition of the ordinary privilege of primogeniture, or the breaking up of hereditary properties, or the breaking down of old families. Old families and hereditary properties are, as I venture to think, good things, provided the dangers and abuses which easily may, but which need not, be associated with them, are guarded against. Feudalism in its original conception was a form of communism, defined by useful and even noble ideas, —ideas, also, which naturally and almost necessarily grew out of the necessities of the times and conditions

then present. There is a wholesome principle of communism underlying some of the traditional maxims which have regulated the management in England of hereditary estates by old families; and I cannot but think that the mere and simple substitution of purely commercial principles, with rack rents and long leases, for the old order of things would hardly be either a beautiful or a beneficial change. If there is to be a change, it must needs be more thorough and revolutionary than any which would commend itself to the ordinary commercial speculator who would seek to purchase or to traffic in land. No doubt, if not a claim of lease, some form of tenant-right, even in England, may be expected to be legally established, as a protection not only to the pecuniary interests, but to the personal and political independence of the tenant. But a mere commercial code of dealing and settlement, supplemented only by some such legal provision as I have just indicated, will be no equitable or adequate substitute for the present order of things if old families, with hereditary properties, and if the right or privilege of primogeniture, are to come to an end. This is very plainly to be learnt from a study of Mr. Mill's ideas on this subject. If those far-thinking and revolutionary ideas are not to be carried out pretty fully, we must, I venture to think, be content to maintain our old families with their hereditary properties and the general privilege of primogeniture for some while yet.

The raising up of a peasant proprietary in some form, and by some means, not only has no necessary connection with the abolition of an hereditary aristocracy, or the forcible breaking up of great estates, but it is

compatible, as in Germany, with the retention of very much more of feudalism than has been found for ages past in this country. It is, at all events, a fact that it has not yet been found possible in any country to secure universal education, or to enforce educational compulsion, unless, in the first instance, the peasantry had been translated from a condition of servile dependence into that of a free proprietary. The only countries in Europe, or indeed in the world, in which education may be regarded as universal, are Switzerland, Holland, and Germany, to which may perhaps be added our own Channel Islands, though, of course, these could hardly be spoken of as a "country." In all these cases the agricultural working classes constitute a peasant proprietary, and most operatives of other classes either own or expect to own a house and home of their own; and this was the case before the system of educational provision was introduced which has made education universal. In Switzerland and Germany education is compulsory and universal by law; but law alone, without a suitable condition and constitution of society, would never have availed to make education universal. A direct compulsory law can only be thoroughly enforced when the conditions of society as well as of public opinion are favourable. In Holland education is not compulsory, and yet may be fairly said to be universal, because the conditions of society for the lower as well as for the upper classes, and the steady and pervasive power of public opinion, are in favour of universal national education. In the Channel Islands there is no compulsory law of education; but such are the favourable conditions of society in these fortunate islands, where the Norse land laws have from the beginning prevailed, and where the sale

and transfer of land are as cheap and easy as of any other property or commodity, that the inhabitants, free as they are from any taint of pauperism, thrifty, industrious, and self-reliant, regard education as a necessary matter of course for their children. It is remarkable that, under our own English crown, so near our own shores, there are islands which, with a population much denser than our own, represent a condition of things in all social respects, so far as the labouring classes are concerned, contrasting so strongly and so favourably with that of our own wealthy but yet largely pauperised country.

In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden the people universally place a high value on education, and make great efforts and sacrifices to secure a good education for their children. In these countries, as in the others to which I have referred, the peasantry are mostly the proprietors of a cottage and a little land ; if not, they may be, and they aim at becoming so. In France the land is far too much divided among small tenants ; the poverty of many is extreme ; the means of education for their children are far from being within the reach of all. But the people universally value education, and, as far as they have the opportunity, they avail themselves of the elementary schools.

In Belgium, indeed—so far as I know in Belgium only—we have an instance of a country in which there exists the fundamental class of a peasant proprietary, and yet the people at large are very deficient in education. Two things, however, must be borne in mind : one, the intense and most bigoted priestly influence which has for many generations dominated society in the country formerly known as the Spanish

or Austrian Netherlands, and now called Belgium, and which has kept the people in ignorance; the other, the fact that for centuries Belgium has been a country of large manufacturing towns. The general result is that the manufacturing operatives are too often ill-educated and improvident, and that the country peasantry, although very frugal and industrious, are commonly very ignorant also. Even in Switzerland, the land of universal education and thrift, the Popish cantons are conspicuously inferior in education and general prosperity to the Protestant. So far as its influence extends, however, the position of the peasantry in relation to the land tends in Belgium, and in the Popish cantons of Switzerland, as elsewhere, to train the people to habits of forethought and of economy favourable to national education.

I do not, indeed, expect that merely to open the way of the English peasant to real property in land, or to the easy, advantageous, and secure tenancy of a piece of land, on such conditions that he may expect to be able in due time to purchase and make it his own, would of itself effect a social transformation in England, nor have I any idea that the general subdivision of the land among a peasant-like proprietary would prove a boon to this country. As I have intimated, the very reverse is my conviction. A small proprietary will be thrifty and diligent, but too little educated, too prejudiced, and too poor, to carry forward great improvements, or to make the best of their land. For minute, painstaking husbandry, and for careful and saving personal habits, a peasant proprietary are not to be equalled; but, as a rule, they must needs lack science, capital,

and enterprise. In France the greater part of the land is subdivided among a peasant proprietary. The effect has been that this proprietary has become saving and diligent to a proverb, and that the land which they till is cultivated like a garden. In English farming there is far less economy of ground, and of what are called natural manures, than in France. But yet England yields twice as much produce from her land, on an average, as France. Science, capital, and manufacturing enterprise, applied to the soil on a large scale, have made the difference. It is notorious, moreover, that, as a rule, the wonderful advance of English agriculture is due as much to the energy, enlightenment, and wealth of the great landowners as even to the skill and enterprise of large farmers; and that small farmers and petty proprietors have equally lagged in the rear of modern improvements.

We cannot but see, furthermore, that in countries where, as in Switzerland, the law requires the subdivision of property among all the children, and the land is entirely in the hands of a numerous body of petty proprietors, a limit must be set to the upward growth and to the national development of the people. The law and the institutions of the country tend to keep all down, as well as up, to a certain level. There can be no upper class possessing the requisite combination of wealth and leisure to attain to the largest views and the highest culture, and capable of leading the nation onward towards the most perfect development of its mental and moral, as well as material, resources. In such a country art will lack patrons of taste and of munificence; scholarship will be wanting in elegance and elevation; society will be

deficient in that grace and refinement which are the characteristics of a true aristocracy; and even the Senate and the Cabinet of the nation will fall short in the most admirable qualities of a sagacious and comprehensive statesmanship, and in the noblest attributes of a large and lofty eloquence.

It is possible that a subdivision of the land among many peasant proprietors may be the system most suitable to the conditions of a republican confederation of small cantons of the peculiar character which belongs to Switzerland. Nor is it open to doubt that, as has been abundantly shown by such able political economists as Mill and Laing, and by many other modern writers of eminence, both English and Continental, the practical limit at which the process of subdivision is all but uniformly arrested, is the *minimum* quantity of land necessary to support one family in tolerable comfort, the co-heirs receiving compensation from the eldest son for their portions, when the land has been reduced to this *minimum*, so as to prevent the subdivision from proceeding farther.* But, for the reasons which have been just assigned, I should certainly not wish to see the Swiss or French principle of subdivision adopted in this country. Nor, indeed, must it be forgotten that, so far as mere money or money's worth, in the way of weekly income, is concerned, the English labourers and operatives are undoubtedly, on the whole, in a

* Notwithstanding all that has been written by the writers referred to in the text, so little is the subject of peasant proprietorship even yet understood in this country, that I fear it may be necessary to point out that the case of Irish cottiers and their continually subdivided "holdings" is not parallel to that of peasant proprietors, but, on the contrary, is in every respect in antithetic contrast to it. On this point any who may want information will do well to refer to a well-known and brilliant chapter in Laing's "Notes of a Traveller." First Series.

better position than the Swiss and French peasantry. If their habits were as frugal, if their cookery was as economical, if their diet and clothing were as homely, even English day labourers would be as well off, in this respect, as most of the French, the Swiss, and the Rhenish peasantry. If they saved their early wages as carefully, and postponed for a few years their marriages, they might be better off. But then they have not, and cannot obtain, the roomy and comfortable Swiss homestead, the house and garden of their own, the independent position in life, or the prospect for the time of old age, which are the heritage of the Swiss, or the Tyrolese, or the Rhenish peasant. Hence the English are, from father to son, paupers, and have no hope but this. In Switzerland, the Tyrol, the Rhenish provinces, the Vosges, pauperism is scarcely known.

I wish to look at this subject with perfect fairness. Our object is to understand precisely in what the English labourers are lacking, and what is likely to be the means of adding this to them. We find that, in a word, all they lack is frugality and providence, with the prospect of an independent provision, to be attained by the exercise of these qualities, and which may be enjoyed by them in the time of their old age. All that they want belongs to the ordinary character and heritage of millions of peasantry in Western and Central Europe, who, in respect of the value of their labour, and likewise of the weekly income which, estimated according to a money value, that labour brings them in, are decidedly inferior to our own countrymen. To what is this striking contrast owing? Not to religious causes, assuredly; not to the nature of the general laws, morals, and govern-

ment of the Continental countries, as compared with our own. In these respects, Protestant and free Britain must be held by us to have greatly the advantage over all Continental lands. Not to an inferior demand for labour in this country, or to inferior productiveness, either in agriculture or manufactures. In these respects, likewise, we are without competitors. As little can the good effect which we mark on the Continent be attributed to a centralised police system: for police, though it may repress crime, can never teach frugality or self-respect. The only cause to which we can refer the difference seems to be the condition of hereditary dependence and pauperism, or semi-pauperism, in which the English peasantry have been so long depressed.

Again I say that I have no wish to set up the condition of Switzerland or of France, as it stands, as a model for admiration. I do not share the raptures of Mr. Joseph Kay* as to the amount of "moral restraint" (as Malthusians call it) which the Swiss and French peasantry exercise, and are compelled to exercise, in postponing till about the age of thirty their marriages, any more than I can admire the remarkable advice given to some French paupers by M. Dunoyer, and on which Mr. Laing comments with such just and fine severity, that they should show their prudence and self-restraint "*en évitant avec un soin extrême de rendre leur mariage plus fécond que leur industrie.*"† I have no desire that the English census should show the same result as the French; or that all the frame of social life, especially so far as

* Kay's "Social Condition and Education of the People," vol. i. ch. 1.

† Laing's Notes, &c., chap. x. (Switzerland).

the questions connected with marriage are concerned, should be so thoroughly demoralised as is the case through a great portion of the Continent, especially some of those parts of it the social economy of which Mr. Kay so highly lauds. I believe, on the contrary, that for a large community to be compelled, from prudential motives, all but uniformly to postpone marriage to a late period must be a fruitful source of frightful immorality. But, on the other hand, over-early marriages, recklessly contracted between raw youths of twenty and girls of seventeen, are an evil scarcely, if at all, of less magnitude than the other. The former is the Continental evil, where the sub-division of land universally obtains; the latter is the English evil, where the land is shut up under entail, and where peasants possess no property, and no prospect of being able to realise any. A certain combination or compromise, in which the two conditions meet and check each other, would furnish the proper medium. But what I wish to particularise is the powerful prudential habit which is implied by such a uniform postponement of marriage as is the rule in Switzerland, and in many parts of France. The very quality in which our peasantry are so wanting is possessed by the peasantry of these districts almost in excess. "This class of the inhabitants," says Mr. Laing, "would no more think of marrying without means to live in a decent way, than any gentleman's sons and daughters in England."

"It is not to the intelligence alone," says Mr. Mill, "that the situation of a peasant proprietor is full of improving influences. *It is no less propitious to the moral virtues of prudence, temperance, and self-control.* The labourer who possesses property,

whether he can read and write or not, has, as Mr. Laing remarks, 'an educated mind; he has *forethought, caution,* and *reflection,* guiding every action; he knows the value of restraint, and is in the constant and habitual exercise of it.'* It is remarkable how this proposition is borne out by the character of the rural population in almost every civilised country where peasant properties are frequent. Day labourers, where the labouring class mainly consists of them, are usually improvident; they spend carelessly to the full extent of their means, and let the future shift for itself. . . . . The tendency of peasant proprietors, *and of those who hope to become proprietors,* is to the contrary extreme. They deny themselves reasonable indulgences, and live wretchedly, in order to economise. In Switzerland almost every one saves who has any means of saving. The case of the Flemish farmers I have already mentioned. Among the French, though a pleasure-loving and reputed to be a self-indulgent people, the spirit of thrift is diffused through the rural population in a manner most gratifying as a whole, and which, in individual instances, errs rather on the side of excess than defect. . . . But some excess in this direction is a small and passing evil, compared with recklessness and improvidence in the labouring classes, and a cheap price to pay for the inestimable worth of the virtue of self-dependence, as the general characteristic of a people—a quality indispensable, in the case of a labouring class, even to any tolerable degree of physical comfort, and by which the peasantry of France, and of most other countries where there is a considerable class of peasant proprietors, are dis-

* Residence in Norway, p. 20.

tinguished beyond any other labouring population."*

"In England," Mr. Mill elsewhere observes, "where the labourer has no investment for his savings but the savings-bank, and no position to which he can rise by any exercise of economy, except, perhaps, that of a petty shopkeeper, with its chances of bankruptcy, there is nothing at all resembling the intense spirit of thrift which takes possession of one who, being a day labourer, can raise himself by saving to the condition of a landed proprietor."†

"Saxony and Bohemia," says Mr. Joseph Kay, "lie side by side. The majority of the people of these two countries speak the same language, profess the same religion, and belong to the same race; but the condition of the peasants of the two countries is as different as can well be imagined. . . . In Saxony, which I have visited and carefully inspected twice, there is very little pauperism; the people are well and comfortably clad; beggars are hardly ever met with; the houses of the peasantry are remarkably large, high, roomy, convenient, substantially built, constantly whitewashed, and orderly in appearance; the children are always clean, well-dressed, and very polite in their manners; there is little or no difference between the appearance of the children of the poor and the rich; the land is perhaps better cultivated than in any other part of Europe; and the general condition of the peasantry more prosperous than that of any other I have seen, except it be that of the peasantry of the cantons of Berne, Vaud, and Neufchatel in Switzerland, or of the Rhine Provinces

* Mill's "Political Economy," vol. i. pp. 346, 347.
† Ibid., p. 359.

of Prussia. . . . In Bohemia, on the other hand, a totally different spectacle presents itself, and one which cannot fail to strike any intelligent traveller with astonishment. The moment he has crossed the Saxon frontier, the traveller finds himself surrounded by crowds of beggars of the most miserable appearance ; where even those peasants who do not beg are very poorly dressed, wear no shoes or stockings, and often appear in rags. The cottages are very small and wretched ; the villages are generally only collections of the most miserable wooden cabins of one story ; and the land itself is only half cultivated, and presents about the same contrast to Saxony as Ireland does to England."*

This was nearly thirty years ago. The causes of the contrast were that in Saxony the land was free from entail restrictions, and, to a great extent, divided among a peasant proprietary, and that a superior class of schools has long been provided for the children ; while in Bohemia the land was strictly entailed in the families of an absentee nobility ; and although schools were provided under the authority of government, these were of an inferior character, and were restricted from educating the children, as we should say, "above their station."

Since Mr. Kay wrote what I have now quoted, the educational and social condition of Bohemia has greatly altered for the better. The contrast, as he observed it, and the lesson conveyed by it are, however, not the less pertinent and useful for our service to-day. The lesson, indeed, is all the more pertinent and decisive, because the alteration for the better followed directly on a fundamental change in the

* Kay, vol. i. pp. 11, 12.

relation of the general population, and in particular, of the peasantry, to the lands.

The peculiar position of our own country to-day in respect to the peasantry and the land is owing to a singular combination of causes. It is due, in part, to the earlier rise and development of personal liberty in England. Churls and villeins broke away from their lords, or gained enfranchisement, here some, and there others, sporadically, so to speak, and gradually, not by any common movement or legislative measure. Moreover, there was an alienation of race and sympathy, for the most part, between the Norman lord and his Saxon or Danish dependent, which made enfranchisement, without any dowry or portion, to be all in most cases that the serf or churl obtained. The German serf was not enfranchised till the present century had set in, but then he was enfranchised, when the time came, by statute, and a good provision made for him out of the land he had tilled. When so enfranchised, excellent schools were provided for his children; and he himself, at once docile from the discipline of centuries, and grateful to the government which had made him free and portioned him with land, was glad to send his children to the school, and felt it to be equally natural and necessary to keep the new educational law. As a serf, indeed, he had been inured for ages to a certain kind and degree of educational compulsion, under ecclesiastical if not civil law. So in Russia the serf has been but lately enfranchised; but now he is not only enfranchised, but dowered with land. As an immediate consequence, his paternal despotism is providing effective education for the enfranchised serf. Britain is immensely in

advance of these countries in general development, civil, industrial, and political, and in all that appertains to the life and progress of all classes except the lowest. But, as respects the lowest classes, the early and unripe precocity of individual liberty in England has seemed for the present to place our social organization at a disadvantage.

A glance at the history of the pauper element in English society will illustrate what I have been saying. I will not attempt to look further back than the times of the Plantagenets. One of Shakspeare's characters, supposed to be speaking in the days of Henry VI., is made to say that "It was never merrie England since gentlemen came up," *i.e.* since the Saxons were subdued by the proud Norman chivalry, *gentleman* being a pre-eminently Norman word—a word smacking strongly of the Norman pride of race and feudal lordship. No doubt the poet had many a time heard that ancient and traditional proverb repeated in the greenwood by the foresters of his native Warwickshire.

Nearly all the common people were either villeins, tied to the land and to the township or lordship, or bond-serfs, the personal property of their lords. Very few, indeed, were the small freeholders, or the free tenants; and these were so much at the mercy of the unscrupulous lords of the soil in their neighbourhood, that it was no uncommon thing for them to renounce their freedom and become villeins *adscripti glebæ*, that they might thus purchase protection at the cost of their liberty. There were besides these, of course, burghers, and free craftsmen, members of trades' guilds; but the number of these was comparatively small. The great bulk of the

population, the commonalty of England, for centuries after the Norman Conquest, consisted of these depressed "sons of the soil." These were the progenitors of the English peasant population of later days. The southern agricultural labourers of to-day are, for the most part, the lineal descendants of the serf and villein population of the southern counties of Britain six centuries ago. Nor is it difficult to trace the stages by which the condition of their ancestors gradually changed into that of the modern day labourer—a change in some things for the better, but in some things also for the worse.

Serfdom became gradually mitigated in character, often rather from the necessities than the good-will of the lords. In its grosser form the spirit of the Church was opposed to it, and many were the bondmen who were manumitted by their lords as a religious duty, and to gain favour with heaven. Villenage lingered much longer in the land, and rather died or wore itself out than was abolished: indeed, neither kind of servitude seems ever to have been abolished by statute. Villenage, though comparatively rare, was by no means extinct in the fifteenth century. "In the year 1514, we find a charter of Henry VIII. enfranchising two slaves belonging to one of his manors. As late as the year 1574, there is a commission from Queen Elizabeth with respect to the manumission of certain bondmen belonging to her."*

The change of condition for the "villein" was, as I have intimated, in some respects, for the worse rather

* Robertson's Charles V., note 20. The colliers in certain parts of Scotland remained bond-slaves, tied to the coal estate, until enfranchised by statute in 1799!

than for the better. If, when his tie to the land and the land's lord ceased, the whole or a sufficient portion of the ground which he had cultivated for his own use had been made his own, his condition would have been bettered, and a class of peasant proprietors would have been created, labourers still, and by no means entrenching on the "demesnes" of the lords, but in a position to become the founders of a frugal, provident, independent order of men, who might have contributed greatly to the strength and excellence of the nation. In some instances this was done, and hence, in great part, arose the yeomanry and the copyholders of England. This was especially the case in those parts of the country where the ancient British influence had lingered longest, and where feudalism had never attained to entire predominance, —such as Cumbria, Wales, and Cornwall.* The same thing was fully carried out in the Norman isles, where the lords and the "villeins" were all of the same race, and where the old Norse law of inheritance never ceased, to a great extent, to prevail. Hence have arisen the peasant proprietors of these lovely

* In reference to the "statesmen" of Cumberland and Westmoreland, Mr. J. S. Mill remarks, "There is but one voice, among those acquainted with the country, on the admirable effects of this tenure of land in those counties. No other agricultural population in England could have furnished the original of Wordsworth's peasantry." In a note he quotes some very striking passages, relating to these peasantry, from Wordsworth's little work on the scenery of the Lakes. A few sentences we cull from the quotations. The upper part of the dales is spoken of as having been for centuries "a perfect republic of shepherds and agriculturists, proprietors, for the most part, of the lands they occupied and cultivated; the members of which existed in the midst of a powerful empire, like an ideal society: neither high-born nobleman, knight, nor esquire was here; but many of these humble sons of the hills had a consciousness that the land which they walked over and tilled had for more than five hundred years been possessed by men of their name and blood."—Mill's *Political Economy*, vol. i. p. 311.

islands, so famed for their temperance and thrift. The same thing substantially took place in Lombardy, and in many parts of Switzerland, in both of which countries the peasantry are proverbially frugal and prosperous. The like happened, to a considerable extent, in Spain, and also, to a still greater extent, in France. In all these cases, be it observed, the people and their lords were of one race. In Germany, as a rule, the peasant population was not enfranchised, as I have already stated, till after the beginning of the present century. Up to that time, in not a few parts, serfdom still prevailed, while nearly all the cultivators of the soil were still peasants *adscripti glebæ*, owing certain dues and services to their manorial lords. But as a direct consequence of the French Revolution, this condition of things was done away throughout nearly the whole extent of Germany, within the first twenty years of the present century. It was, however, done away on the principle that, with certain abatements and subtractions, in compensation for the dues and services which were taken from the owners of the soil, the peasants should become the proprietors of the land they tilled. At the same time provision was made for the efficient education of the now enfranchised population. The result, on the whole, has been successful beyond all that could have been expected. Instead of a pauper peasantry, Germany, in those parts of it which are well administered, has a thrifty and provident race of well-to-do peasant proprietors.*

* The following (slightly abridged) quotation from Mr. Laing will illustrate not only the statement contained in the text, but also several other statements which I have made relating to the general subject under discussion :—

"Previous to 1800, landed property was, on the greater part of the

The dates at which these changes were effected for all parts of Germany are given by De Tocqueville in note D to his work on "France before the Revolution of 1789." Generally they range from 1804 to 1814. But serfdom was not abolished in Lusatia till 1832, nor in Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen till 1833.

Continent, divided into noble or baronial, and peasant, roturier, or not noble holdings. The baronial estates, by far the greatest in extent, had the peasantry who were born on the land *adscripti glebæ;* had a right to their labour every day for the cultivation of the domain; had civil and criminal jurisdiction over them in the baronial court of the estate; had a baronial judge, a baronial prison, and a baronial bailiff to flog them for neglect of work or other baronial offences. These slaves were allowed cottages with land upon the outskirts of the estate, and cultivated their own patches in the hours or days when their labour was not required on the barony lands. They paid tithes and dues out of their crops to the minister, the surgeon, the schoolmaster, and the barony judge . . . . If the serf deserted, he was brought back by the military, imprisoned, and flogged. . . . This system was in full vigour up to the beginning of the present century, and not merely in remote and unfrequented corners of the Continent, but in the centre of her civilisation; all round Hamburg and Lubeck, for instance, in Holstein, Schleswig, Hanover, Brunswig, and all over Prussia. Besides these baronial estates, with the born serfs attached to them, there were peasant estates, which held generally of some baron, but were distinct properties, paying as feu duties or quit-rents so many days' labour in the week, with other feudal services and payments. The acknowledgment of these as distinct legal properties, not to be recalled, so long as the peasant performed the services and payments established either by usage or by writings, was the first great step in Prussia towards the change in the condition of the peasantry. It was stretched so far as to include the serfs located on the outskirts of the barony, and paying daily labour for their patches of land, who, by long usage and occupation for generations, had become a kind of hereditary tenants, not to be distinguished from what we would call copyholders. Prince Hardenberg's energetic administration made all these occupants the absolute proprietors of their several holdings, and had the quit-rents valued, commuted, and brought up from the dominant property, under inspection of commissioners, by the surrender of a portion of the land of the servient property, if the peasant had no money for the purchase of the redemption. This great and good measure, which was projected and carried into effect by Stein and Hardenberg in a succession of edicts, from that of October 9th, 1807, up to June 7th, 1821, is the great and redeeming glory of the reign of Frederick William III., and, like all great and good measures, was accomplished with much less difficulty than was anticipated. Feudality had become effete."—LAING'S *Notes of a Traveller*. First Series. Part I. chap. iii.

But what happened in the case of the countries I have now mentioned did not take place in England. The lords and the villeins were of different races; feudalism was carried to its utmost height; the proud spirit of the Norman aristocrats could brook no owners of land who were not of their own blood. Had there been good understanding and mutual affection between the lord and his villeins, these, remaining on the land from generation to generation, would have gradually grown into peasant proprietors. But the turbulent spirit of the Saxon peasant, who could not forget the bitterness of the foreign yoke, and the answering contempt of the Norman gentleman, prevented this from being brought about. The peasants were glad to break away from their tie. The price which they paid for their liberty was the forfeiture of the land which they had cultivated. This was often a good bargain for the lord,—more often, it may be feared, a bad bargain for the peasant.

What the lord lost was but, for the most part, the personal service and the partial labour of his villein, the value of which in many cases was little or nothing. All the labour or service that he required could be much better done by far fewer persons, entirely devoted to the work. What he gained was the land which had maintained his villein and family. This he might sell, and so convert into money what had been before all but valueless; or he might take it into his own domain, and farm it to the best advantage. Whereas the villein or serf, having obtained his freedom, must either pay his lord a money-rent for the land which he had cultivated, or he must leave it altogether, and go forth portionless into the world. In any case his children had lost their

inheritance. The land which had descended in their family of right, so long as they held the servile relation, passed altogether into the hand and property of the lords of the domain, when they had become freemen.

The effect of this could not but presently begin to tell. Doubtless from this time the land, in many cases, came to be better farmed, and to yield a much larger return both of produce and of money-value. But it supported in comfort fewer families in proportion to the population. The increased profits were not divided equally among all those who laboured upon it, but were swept into the revenue of the lord. The wealth of the country grew apace; but the cultivators were, at least relatively, and many of them positively, poorer and more depressed than they had ever been. Whereas, formerly, the surplus labour of the villeins and their sons, beyond what was merely sufficient to obtain present necessaries for their families, went to augment their common stock of comforts and of property, now the employer purchased of them all their strength and skill at the lowest rate for which it was to be had. And as fewer hands could, with harder work and better system, do all and more than all that had been done before, there was, so far as I can find, almost always a surplus of labour in the general market, which enabled the employers to get their work done for just as little as was necessary to feed and clothe their labourers from day to day. It is plain how all this was likely to work, and history tells us how it did work.

The first two notices on the Statute Book of the existence in the land of pauperism and beggary occur within the reign of Edward III., in the years 1349

and 1376. In the previous century the upward movement of the English commonalty had begun; and, by this time, the enfranchisement of the servile classes had made great progress. The statute of 1376 throws some light upon the spirit in which this movement proceeded. It enacts severe punishments for "runaway servants," *i.e.* serfs or slaves; it speaks of the runaways as turning "staff-strikers," and is eloquent against "sturdy rogues." In the reign of Richard II. we have three statutes on the same subject, of the dates respectively of 1382, 1388, and 1391; in the second of which we find the fact recognised, for the first time, that there was a class of destitute poor, who were so through misfortune or old age, and not from any fault or unwillingness to labour on their own part. Of these it appears that there were at that time great numbers. They are commended to charity. In 1402, under the reign of Henry IV., there is a further statute referring to the same subject. All these acts prescribed severe penalties against thieving and mendicancy, but all in vain. During the civil wars Parliament had no leisure to attend to this subject. Besides which it is likely enough that many strollers, whether called "thieves" or "mendicants," turned soldiers on one side or the other, and found slaughter and robbery furnish occupation greatly to their taste. But, in the reign of Henry VII., Parliament was again obliged to turn its attention to what appears to have by this time become a greatly aggravated evil. And henceforward we find, extending throughout the palmy period of England's greatness under the Tudor dynasty,—when some would have us think that employment never failed and plenty was the uniform

attendant of diligence,—a series of savage and barbarous statutes relating to this subject, which prove that the evil of pauperism was deep and desperate. One of these, passed in 1547, under the reign of Edward VI., and which re-enacted, with certain aggravations, a former cruel law of Henry VIII., provided that all vagabonds, being "whole and mighty in body," should be branded with a red-hot iron, and made "the slaves" for two years of the persons informing against them. This law did, in fact, re-enact slavery under its most cruel and revolting forms. All these statutes agreed in forbidding, under terrible penalties, "sturdy and valiant beggars" from going about to beg, and in requiring them to labour for their living. But not one prescribed how labour was to be found for them.

This was the pinch of the case. High wages might, *for half the year*, be given to skilled craftsmen; but the poor day labourers were left, in many instances, without employment. Sometimes parishes were ordered to find them employment; but *how* is not defined.

It must be plain to every attentive reader of the history and records of the sixteenth century that a perpetually increasing torrent of vagrants, most of them "sturdy and valiant beggars," was pouring through the whole land. We have seen that this had begun before the dissolution of the monasteries; nor can it be supposed, as it has been by many, that that event had any considerable effect in permanently increasing the number of vagrants. There is evidence to show that the monasteries at this time did much less in the way of providing for the poor than has been supposed; and there can be little doubt

that they bred full as much pauperism and vagrancy as they relieved. Henry VIII. is said to have hanged 72,000 robbers and vagabonds; but, to judge from the statutes of Edward VI., the evil increased notwithstanding. It continued to increase throughout the sixteenth century, the period of Mr. Froude's admiration, till at length, in the very reign of Elizabeth herself, by the Acts of 1562, and especially of 1601, unemployed poor were for the first time made rateable on the parish. In 1662 was enacted the old Law of Settlement, binding the labourer to his parish, and so restoring, in one respect, the slavish law of villenage, but without the compensating advantage of that law. This oppressive enactment was patiently borne more than a century, not having been repealed till 1795. This brings us to the year when the final and pernicious system of Poor Law management under the old Poor Law was introduced into this country. Times were bad. The American war had impoverished and discouraged the country; then came the war against revolutionary France, with its drain and its reverses. There were, in the latter part of the last century, and in the beginning of the present—in what some probably still persist in regarding as the "good old times"—many bad harvests, and, as a consequence, the price of bread and provisions was often very high. Under these circumstances all suffered, many suffered greatly, and the labouring classes were several times reduced to an almost desperate condition. These facts may perhaps help to account for the rise and spread of the system of Poor Law administration to which I have referred. That system itself rapidly tended to demoralise and degrade the population of the

Southern and South-Midland agricultural counties of this country. The recent wonderful development of manufactures saved, to a considerable extent, the northern counties from its pernicious operation.

This system seems to have been first distinctly arranged and acted on by the Berkshire magistrates. It is set forth in the minutes of a magistrates' meeting, held at Speenhamland, near Newbury, on May 6th, 1795, and published in the *Reading Mercury* of that date.* It provided, with the best and most humane intentions, that relief should be given to the poor, whether in or out of employment, making up the wages of all alike in a certain ratio according to the number in the family. Thus the labourers were rendered independent of labour, and the consciences of the farmers relieved from all responsibility as to adapting their rate of wages to the price of provisions, or to the industry and skill of the labourer. Thus all distinctions as to payment were done away. Whether the labourer were indolent or indigent, slovenly or careful, ignorant or skilful, it was all the same. Character lost all marketable value. The industrious small farmer was taxed to make up the pay of the idle and dissolute labourer, who was made to fare as well as himself. "Independence was discouraged, improvidence was rewarded, and the labouring class was proclaimed free of those moral restraints which act so beneficially in all other orders of the community." For forty years this ruinous system was in force; and the amount of idleness, vice, perjury, and crime of every kind which it bred, it is impossible to calculate. It would have broken down

* See Appendix (B) to First Annual Report of Poor Law Commissioners. No. 4. Mr. Hall's Report.

the agricultural interest, but that the war and the Corn Laws together kept up an unnaturally high price of corn. Such a price ought to have given high wages to the poor; but the Poor Law kept down wages, and enabled the farmer, who was usually also an overseer, to get the deficiency of wages paid out of the public purse. But such a system could not have failed, in the end, to bring ruin upon all classes. It demoralised the character and destroyed the manliness of the southern labourer; it buried the small tradesman or farmer, however industrious, under the weight of parochial taxation. The close of the war made matters worse. Prices fell somewhat, and the labour market was glutted. Those who left the army were for the most part idle and vicious, and not unfrequently also ferocious. The brand of those evils has deeply scarred the character of the labouring classes in those counties where this system was fully carried out. In Gloucestershire things were not so bad as in the southern counties generally, owing probably to the woollen manufacture in that county. The system there was cautiously and prudently worked. There the poor rate averaged about 8*s.* 11*d.* for each inhabitant, man, woman, and child. But in Wiltshire it rose as high as 16*s.* 7*d.*; in Suffolk as 30*s.*, and even 40*s.*,—a perfectly frightful amount of taxation. And there, accordingly, we find that all was rotten from one end to the other—contractor, farmers, and paupers, altogether completely demoralised.*

The above slight sketch will afford some idea of the condition of the English poor in the various ages

* See Appendix (B) to First Annual Report of Poor Law Commissioners. No. 2.

of our history. No doubt there have been better and worse times; but never at any time, since they became legally "free," have these classes been otherwise than dependent and pauperised. The old Poor Law did but aggravate an evil centuries old. It did but take the last touch of old English manliness from the character of those who had never known what true independence meant; it deepened the servile taint in the soul of those whose position had never been much more than nominally superior to that of serfdom. It met the pauper spirit by giving to it the beggar's dole; it adapted itself to the improvidence of the labourer by setting a premium on idleness, and levying a tax on industry. It could never have been carried out as it was if servile ideas had not been widely diffused among the labouring population, and if the farmers and gentry had not been long accustomed to regard the labourers as mere pauper pensioners. It no doubt made everything worse, but it effected no transformation of character. That system has happily been done away. The present system is no doubt much to be preferred. One result of the change may perhaps have been some improvement in the manliness and self-reliance of the Southern and South-Midland peasantry. But surely it is something monstrous and altogether discreditable, that such a stupendous mechanism as that of the present Poor Laws should have become necessary. It is only custom that has reconciled us to it. If, for the first time, its meaning were exhibited to us, we should feel how unnatural must be the condition of things which has rendered it necessary for us.

The slight survey which has now been made is

useful as showing how our national pauperism originated, and how it has grown and increased to its present dimensions. If this history is compared with the experience and condition of Continental countries, where pauperism, as a national institution, is unknown, the conclusion is irresistibly forced upon us, that the cure, the only possible cure, of the monster evil under which this country groans, with all the complex social corruptions which result from it, including ignorance, improvidence, and sensual indulgence among the rest, is to furnish the working peasant with a proper plot of ground to begin with, on which to work for his own benefit, and to show him the way by which he may gradually redeem this plot and make it his own. Something must be done to improve the position of agricultural labourers, at least in the Southern and South-Midland counties. It would cost the farmer twopence halfpenny a week per man to give each labourer free a third of an acre of land. To the labourer himself so much land would be worth several shillings a week. If he only had a way opened gradually to make it his own, by an arrangement with the landlord through the farmer, the labourer would work upon it all the better, would get and save all the more out of it, and in most instances would presently become the owner of it. Every piece of land so redeemed by the peasant's own labour would represent a family taken permanently and securely off the pauper roll, a family transformed from ignorant and desponding dependence, to content and intelligence, to providence and hope.

A true radical reform in the direction thus indicated appears to be the most pressing necessity in England's social condition. It would bring with it

nothing but good; it would effect no revolution but where revolution is most sorely needed.

England is the country of compromises and amalgamations. Our population is a rich amalgam; our constitution is a system of compromises. Our judicial procedures and our legislation are full of compromises. Unlike most other countries of Europe where the peasantry have been fully emancipated from oppression and from prædial ties, England would, if all were done for which I plead, still retain her wealthy landed aristocracy, as the Corinthian capital of her column. She would also retain her large and wealthy agricultural tenants, a race of men of whom she has great reason to be proud, the fit appendage and counterpart of her nobility, many of these being also, to some considerable extent, proprietors of land. In the neighbourhood of large towns, and where the land is particularly rich and profitable, a smaller class of farms will always be in great request, manageable by men of moderate capital and great skill or energy. As agricultural intelligence and science grow up to something like maturity, and become diffused through the agricultural community, and as capital becomes more abundant, a class of freeholders, cultivating their own estates of moderate size, will emulate in wealth and prosperity the large tenant farmers. Large farms will come to be worked by *firms* in partnership, and a class of able managers will be employed, who will often rise to the position of partners. Small farms will be rare, and only tenanted to profit by men of more than ordinary skill, science, and personal energy, who, by means of these, may be able to work their way upward to larger holdings. There will be countless multitudes of small tenements, with

a few roods of ground attached, which will be owned and occupied by peasant labourers, whose sons are mostly occupied as day labourers upon large neighbouring farms, and there will be not a few good houses, with some acres of land attached, owned and occupied by operatives or small shopkeepers who have invested their savings in their purchase. I hold that every labourer ought to be able, if he has the will and ability, to purchase a cottage and a small plot of land, so as to provide himself a home. The man that toils upon the ground has a right to have his own home there. The dependence of labourers upon miserable cottage vacancies, and the insufficient number as well as accommodation of the rural cottages, compelling indecent habits and a disgusting overcrowding of the inmates, are crying evils and public nuisances that need at once to be remedied. After one generation had provided themselves with cottage homes and gardens, the increase in demand for them would not be very great. And what more beautiful sight than to see the domain of the wealthy landowner belted round by border-lines of cottages, the property of a happy, thrifty, independent peasantry, whose families gain their living by working on the estate? There is nothing incompatible and impracticable in this. It would still be open to the landlord to build and let cottages if he pleased. And if they were such as the Duke of Bedford and Lord Leicester have built for their labourers, the peasants would often, if they had security against sudden ejectment, prefer renting such tenements to buying or building their own. The competition, in these cases, would be wholesome.*

* See Note at the end of this chapter.

The effect of such a change as I am describing would not only be to set before the young labourer an object to save for,—a worthy hope and ambition which he might reasonably expect to attain,—thus tending to make him frugal and provident; it would *also* effect a revolution in the dwellings of the poor throughout the rural districts. Let any one compare the homes of the peasant proprietors of Switzerland, of the Tyrol, or of the Norman Isles, with the hovels of too many of our peasantry, and he will see what nations and races not so fond of comfort as we English are reputed to be will do for themselves, when they feel that they are building, enlarging, improving, beautifying their own homes. Here, then, would come in another grand educational influence, without the co-operation of which much of the instruction bestowed in schools must be in vain.

The operation of all this upon the labourer's hopes and views for his family will be apparent. The peasant proprietors of Switzerland set a high value on education for their children; they know its worth. Let a man have a chance of rising a little way in the world, of leaving a place and a name behind for his family, and helping to set them a little higher than he has climbed himself; such a man will know how to prize school-training for his children. Let frugality, providence, and an honourable ambition, once be developed in the character of the poor man; and he cannot but begin intelligently and far-sightedly to regard the future career of his offspring. How can the hopeless, reckless, from hand-to-mouth labourer be expected to care for his child's education?

This refers to the *peasantry* of the country. But whatever acts upon their character, must react upon

the character of the town operatives. Besides, these also would be acted upon directly by any effective measures for cheapening and facilitating the transfer of land. There are few working men to whom the prospect of an easy investment of their money in land or houses would not prove much more stimulating than the premium offered by the savings-bank. Moreover, better cottages in the country would lead to better cottages in the towns. In towns, however, other things ought to be done. Corporations should do their part, by securing a full proportion of comfortable separate cottages, with yards or gardens, as far as possible, for the use of the labouring population, and by enforcing the strictest regulations and scrutiny in regard to lodging-houses. London has set a sad example by building handsome streets, and forgetting to provide cheap and clean and wholesome accommodation for the poor. For how much of the dreadful demoralisation of London and our large towns generally is this sort of neglect to blame! Assuredly, education in many cases will be of little purpose so long as our slums and courts, and many-storied tenements in low neighbourhoods, remain as they are. *Their* education is undoing the Christian school education.

Much, indeed, in the direction which has been indicated is being accomplished in different parts of the country, and especially in some of our manufacturing towns. The difficulties in the way of getting land are in part overcome, though at a considerable cost of money, and, in some cases, with some insecurity as to tenure, by Freehold Land Societies and Benefit Building Societies. What are called "Freehold Assurance Societies" have also begun to

attract public attention. All these contrivances, however, are circuitous, expensive, and more or less surrounded by risk and uncertainty; and, consequently, their efficiency for the purposes they are contemplating is greatly impaired. As a general rule, also, they are only available for the town populations; the agricultural peasantry they scarcely reach. The popularity, however, of these societies, with all their disadvantages, and the extent to which they are beneficially operative in the way of inducing habits of providence among the labouring classes, afford a strong argument in favour of such measures as I have advocated, and warrant the hope that they would conduce to important results in the way of improving the general character of our working men.

It would not be right to ignore the beneficial operation of Friendly Societies, of Working Men's Associations, and the like. All these things are good; but it is only of late that they have come under wise and safe regulations. We cannot but look for good results, also, at least in the way of educating the general mind of the operative community, from co-operative stores, partnerships *en commandite*, and similar methods of uniting working men in common undertakings and responsibilities. But the means and facilities to which I have last been adverting are not available for our agricultural population. For them the main and staple remedy on which I have insisted would appear to be the only one available. No doubt the long-promised measures for facilitating the sale and transfer of land by registry of titles and otherwise, will do good service whenever the country really gets them. But more than this is wanted. The case of the agricultural labourer as such must be taken in

hand, with a view both to securing to him the easy and profitable use of the land plot he needs, and to giving him the legal right, if he can find the means, to redeem it for himself at a fair price. Not till this, or something equivalent to this, is done, is England likely to possess a race of educated peasantry. For many years past, but especially during the past twenty years, and most of all during the last four years, the commerce and wealth of this country have increased amazingly, of late by stupendous bounds, yet English pauperism, during the same period, has very slightly diminished in ratio. There appears no prospect of its being cured by merely indirect means and influences. At any rate, we cannot afford to await, during many generations, the result of circuitous and most tardy processes. The virtue, the content, the comfort, the manliness, the Christian character and hopes of millions of our countrymen are involved in this question. While we wait, generations die.

Our ideal picture of what the working classes of this country might become is already realised in one part of Germany, in the level districts of Lower Silesia. I copy the description from one of the volumes of "Reports from Diplomatic and Consular Agents as to the Industrial Classes of Foreign Countries" (1871). "The condition of the artisan population is, on the whole, a satisfactory one. The workmen employed in the industrial establishments situated in the plains are in peculiarly favourable circumstances. A great many of them are settled on little properties of their own, and nearly all employ themselves out of working hours in cultivating the ground, and raise the greater part of the vegetables

and potatoes for their own consumption. The working population is more and more disposed towards frugal household management, in order by careful economy to save money, without at the same time stinting themselves in respect to their bodily wants. Owing to the moderation and sobriety of their mode of living the workmen enjoy bodily health, at the same time that their moral condition is raised. The demand for instruction and efforts to improve themselves intellectually are visibly on the increase amongst the working classes."* So, from Würtemberg, one of the best educated states in Germany, we learn that "the tendency to acquire bits of land marks one of the most favourable features in the character of the Würtemberg working classes."†

France is not in any respect a model country. Nevertheless the general sobriety and frugality of the lower classes, even the town operatives, bears testimony to the effect on the national character of the peasant proprietorship. Paris must not in this, or in any respect, be taken as typical of France; in many respects Paris is in antithesis to the country at large, the working class forming, in large proportion, a proletarian population, demoralised by Government bounty and pampering, and by the vice and temptations of the great pleasure-capital of the world. The character of the working and indeed of all classes through a great part of France is, at least at one point, much more fairly represented by that of the Nice artisan, as given by Mr. Elmore, although of course this is the opposite extreme, the extreme of poverty and semi-starvation. "The amount of work

* Pp. 451, 452.
† Ibid., Volume for 1872, p. 202.

he effects in a day is but little ; this may arise from the fact that, in general, he is ill fed, *for he will attempt to save from very low wages.*" *

But for an illustration of the points on which I have been dwelling, I will turn to what Lord Brabazon, in his very able report on France generally, has to tell respecting the Cité Ouvrière, at Mulhouse. Although Mulhouse is now in Germany, this instance may fairly be given as a specimen of French economy, especially as the model here presented is likely to be adopted extensively through the manufacturing districts of France. "The workmen's dwellings consist of rows of two-storied houses, each with a garden attached, and the condition of the lease is such that a workman, after a certain number of years, can obtain the freehold of his house. This has an immense moral influence on the population. The workman feels that he is the possessor of a real home, that in a few years he will become a proprietor, and thus the whole character of the man is changed. His self-respect increases, he feels himself a member of the body politic, and his interests enlist him on the side of order. In proof of this I will relate the following anecdote which occurred in real life." †

Lord Brabazon's anecdote is very interesting, but I need not quote it. I have cited enough to illustrate the point which I desire to keep in view, the connection between property and education, between property and an educated mind and character, from which arises hereditary educational influence.

Even in England we are not without the means of illustrating the same principle. The "statesmen" of Cumberland and Westmoreland, while the class still

* Ibid., p. 172. † Page 63.

survived, were, as all familiar with the history and tradition of those counties know, peculiarly careful as to the education of their children. In the same counties, to this day, and among the neighbouring dalesmen, the same spirit still strongly lives. The lead miners, again, of the same neighbourhood, of Cumberland and Durham, are a race of men who work in the mine, but who also have a bit of land, each man with his cottage, held on a secure and easy tenancy. This race of men is pre-eminent for their intelligence, frugality, and appreciation of education; and among the most effective schools I have seen are those maintained in connection with the lead mines in which they work. I may particularly refer to the school at Nenthead. On the other hand, if we leave these people and go to the colliers of Durham and Northumberland, living not far away, we find the picture, too commonly, sadly reversed in all respects, in respect equally of cottage, cottage-tenure, and garden-plot, and also of frugality and care for education. So also, in South Wales, we shall find, not far apart, iron miners who resemble the lead miners of the North in frugality, intelligence, and love of education, and colliers who are far worse than those of the North for ignorance and coarse wastefulness. In this case, as in the other, the difference is clearly traceable to the diverse conditions, as to home and land plot, under which the respective classes are living. Wherever, in short, a population of manual labourers is obliged to live in cottages of which they are the insecure and accidental tenants from quarter to quarter, or from month to month, or, as is most common in this country, from week to week, and with no plot of garden ground, such a population is

invariably found, as a class, to be improvident and self-indulgent, to have very little sense of the value of education for their children, and to be generally indisposed to take any pains or exercise any self-denial to procure it. Wherever, on the other hand, a population has a secure tenancy, with a sufficient garden plot, or consists mostly of the proprietors of cottage and garden which make up the family home, such a population needs no compulsory law to oblige it to take care of the education of the children. There appears to be no exception to this rule in any country or class in the world. It is remarkable, furthermore, that wherever, by means of Freehold Land Societies or similar institutions, a working town population has come to be, to any considerable extent, proprietors of their own cottage homes, such a population has immediately shown an improved appreciation of the value of good schools. This statement might be illustrated by a reference to many towns in Lancashire, the Staffordshire potteries, and Yorkshire. The child, moreover, under such conditions, grows up in an educated home, in an atmosphere favourable to forethought and frugality, under favourable educational conditions. He learns instinctively to think himself of saving and of becoming a proprietor in a small way on his own account. A wholesome, honest, modest ambition is insensibly instilled into his mind by the condition and sentiments, the spirit and influence of his parents. The school education and the home education co-operate and concur, and the rising youth grows up to make the best of his circumstances.

Nor is this all. The extract I have given from Lord Brabazon shows how such a condition of things

as I have described tends immediately and of necessity to make the French working man a friend of order and a stable member of society. The same lesson is taught by an extract which Mr. Kay has quoted in his work, already several times referred to, from a book by the Prussian Counsellor Reichensperger on questions connected with agriculture, and which shows how the same law operates in Germany.

"It is these labourers, entirely without possessions, whether they are found in the factories or behind the plough, who are the really dangerous members of society. The real ground of their dangerous character lies in their freedom from any moral restraint, caused by the hopelessness and poverty of their social position. The evils with which the position of these classes threatens society, can only be avoided by removing the helplessness and destitution of their social position. The simplest, most efficacious, and most legitimate means, by which to attain this great end, is to free landed property from all restrictions preventing its sale, and gradually, and by means of the natural sale of the lands, to enable the labourers to acquire property." *

To the same effect, substantially, is the evidence of Lord Napier and Ettrick. This accomplished nobleman may almost be said to have "surveyed mankind from China to Peru." Prior to the six years which he recently fulfilled as Governor of Madras, he had resided, in her Majesty's diplomatic service, for a considerable period, besides Teheran and Constantinople, at each of the following capitals—Amsterdam, Vienna, St. Petersburg, Berlin, Florence, and Washington. He has made educational and social questions his

* Kay, vol. i. p. 72.

study, and he was President of the Social Science Association at Plymouth last autumn. The following extract from a letter addressed to myself last January, in acknowledgment of an Address I had sent him on the subject of Education, will sufficiently show what are his lordship's views, what the result of his almost unrivalled observation and experience in regard to the subject now under review :—"You have pointed out, in prudent but striking terms, the close connection which exists between education and property. The diffusion of education, especially of a secular character, among a free people, without a contemporaneous extension of the benefits and enjoyments of personal and real property, would be the creation of a vast element of indigent and aspiring intelligence—the greatest danger to the morality and stability of a State. So at least it appears to me; but this truth is so little apparent to most, even to the enlightened and philanthropic, that I sometimes ask myself whether it be a truth at all! Most people appear to think that the English people can go on quietly and patiently as a nation of day labourers and lodgers, with general intellectual cultivation, and numerous impulses and encouragements to a higher mental and social development in individual cases, supplied by State or private endowments. I confess I cannot see how the two conditions can be co-existent—an educated people will not in the long run submit to the humiliations and insecurities of the social position of our labouring classes; or regard with resignation the tremendous inequalities and concentrations of wealth which we witness. How the benefits of property are to be more equally diffused with due regard to the rights of property, public order, the employment of

capital in culture, and the present high rate of production from land, is a problem well worthy of careful study. I think we may aim at present at freehold habitations for the industrial classes, through the instrumentality of the building societies; at improved cottages, with garden plots and pasture allotments for the labourers and rural mechanics, held at first as tenancies-at-will; then under lease, with provisions for gradual redemption; at last as freeholds. But such a development of the condition of the labouring classes, in reference to habitations and property, could only safely take place under regulations which would invest the sanitary authorities with absolute power in controlling the site and construction of new dwellings both in town and country."

As matters now are, England is, and appears likely to remain, the great centre, treasury, and workshop of the International Society. Our best hope against this perilous organization would be in the wide extension of property amongst our working classes. The peasant proprietary of France operates as a vast non-conducting medium surrounding the combustible and unprincipled Parisian working-class population. Everywhere, indeed, on the Continent, the peasantry in general constitute a powerful counterpoise against the revolutionary spirit and plans of certain classes of the artisan population. Among the artisans themselves the "International" has less play and influence just in proportion as these classes have become —as in many parts of the Continent they have extensively become—themselves proprietors. The "International" will not find a league and array of resolute enemies in the peasantry of England. On the contrary, it is not unlikely to find among that

hitherto inert, but now awakening, class a ripe and ready harvest of discontent and animosity against capital and privilege, of which it will make store. England is ready marked out as the field in which agrarian communism is not unlikely rankly to grow. The agitation now in its beginning may lead to this result; school education, so far as it is effective, may only, as Lord Napier intimates, give edge and intelligence and energy to class-jealousy and to long-smouldering and at length out-blazing discontents and animosities. The cure for all this, if it be not too late altogether to prevent it, will not assuredly be found in school education alone. Education and property must be fitly related to each other, or great evil will be the near result, whatever good may ultimately follow.

NOTE, p. 75.

The following passage from a work published by me several years ago more fully expresses what is intimated in the text :—

"An interesting article from the pen, if I mistake not, of Dr. Blaikie, appeared a few years ago in the 'North British Review,' February, 1861, under the title 'Large Farms and the Peasantry of the Scottish Lowlands.' This article was designed to show that where, in any country, large farms are the only tenancies, the effect upon the peasantry is very dispiriting and demoralising; and that, besides large farms as one element in the agricultural prospects of a nation, there must be other holdings, if both the land and the people are to be duly cultivated and cared for.

"Large farms he acknowledges, as all candid men must acknowledge, to have been the greatest instrument hitherto, in connection with adequate capital, in stimulating scientific agriculture, in carrying forward 'high farming' in this country to its present pitch. And he desires that large farms should always be obtainable, in a fair proportion to the total number of farms, as prizes in the general market, and for the sake of those leaders of the agricultural community who shall possess such a combination of large capital with experience, science, and enterprise, as may enable them to work such farms to advantage.

But besides these, he would have homesteads and holdings of every gradation of value and acreage, from the good cottage with its large garden, through the small 'pendicle' of from three to ten acres, and small farms of forty or fifty acres, to the large holding of two thousand acres. He hints, moreover, that he should be pleased if there were any hope of seeing, mixed up with the class of labourer-holders, that of peasant proprietors; but seems to imagine that any such consummation is far too good to be hoped for in feudal Britain, notwithstanding the high authority in its favour.

"The reviewer gives emphatic utterance to a most important truth. Whilst making the admissions which I have already stated as to the actual benefits to agriculture in this country which have arisen out of the system of large farms, he adds that 'it is not a truth valid for all places and all times that large farms are the only arrangement that will ensure the highest state of husbandry.' He shows, moreover, that that very distinguished agriculturist, Sir John Sinclair, himself an advocate for large farms, and writing at the time when the feeling in favour of large farms was at its highest (1814), nevertheless explains and demonstrates how such farms are needed in a predominant proportion at the commencement of a career of agricultural advancement; but shows that afterwards, as agricultural skill and science become fully developed and widely diffused, a mixture of farms of smaller size and of various gradations, would be advantageous. Moreover, the reviewer adduces decisive evidence that in Dumfriesshire, where holdings and farms of every gradation of size are let on long leases, the result is, on the whole, superior as to profit and productiveness to what is found in the Lothians, where there are none but large farms; with this great additional advantage, *that pauperism in these parts is almost extinguished.*

"But I am not so much concerned with the comparative results of large farming, and of other systems, as regards the crops that are got off the earth. The main question is the effect of one or another system on the people. Does any man, not utterly besotted with pelf, suppose that it will pay, in the long run, that it will pay the nation,—ay, or pay *him* in any true sense,—to grow enormous crops on his acres, while the labourers, as a class, are depressed and barbarised? Which is the more valuable crop to the nation, turnips or peasants? If, to cultivate the land high, the peasantry, instead of being cultured, must be debased, is it worth a patriot's or a Christian's while to insist upon high farming? The nation, and in particular the landowners, have a duty to perform—a duty of stewardship, on behalf of their fellowmen, their brethren, their countrymen. *They* are the nation's farm,—and this farm should be cultivated well and highly. That this may be done, and yet the land be loaded with the very heaviest crops, I am optimist enough heartily to believe. But, doubtless, there are two ways of doing it. There were two ways of acquiring wealth by factory labour. The old way sacrificed the operative; but it was needful, we were told, since manufactures must be carried on; and it was on the whole good for the country, we were told, since an enormous production was attained, to which the world had seen no parallel. But the ten hours' bill came, teaching that the bodies and souls of the people must first be looked to. Well, wealth is made still, but better made; not always so easily, but on the whole

more safely; and a manufacturing population is growing up healthy, animated, intelligent, whereas, on the old plan, they were rapidly deteriorating from generation to generation. So we may be sure that eventually farming will be more productive, and that every class will be benefited, in proportion as land is so farmed, and let, and held, as shall most conduce to the training up of a virtuous, self-reliant, provident, and hopeful labouring class.

"We ought never to forget the principle which has been already laid down that the labouring population of England are, pre-eminently, the people of England. For their benefit, more than for that of any other class,—if classes are ever to be separately regarded,—should the Government be carried on and the laws be made. At any rate, to defend any law, or system, or method, by which they suffer, on the plea that, on the whole, it is good for the nation, is an absurdity; or, if not an absurdity, a most insulting piece of arrogance. The comparatively small minority ought never to be spoken or thought of as the nation.

"The witness of the reviewer is true when, having admitted the benefits, in various ways, of large farms, he adds that 'the peasantry have not, on the whole, shared equally in those benefits.' Large farms have been combined with an artificially, unnaturally, injuriously restricted number of labourers' cottages. The feudal power of the landlord, the trammels of entail, and the fear of increasing the number of poor to be supported, have led to this result. Hence a disproportionate number of single labourers, for whose lodging there has been no natural and proper provision; who have herded together in the kitchen and out-houses, or have been lodged in the 'bothy.' The former system is incurably bad; the latter, by care, and zeal, and conscience on the part of the employers, may be made comfortable, and possibly even a means of improvement. But, as a matter of fact, this is seldom the case; while at the best all is dependent on the liberality and enlightenment of the farmer, or the landowner, or both; usually all depends on the farmer.

"The other evil of an exclusive system of large farms is, as the reviewer puts it, that the peasantry 'are shut out from all hope of bettering themselves, and compelled to a life-long routine of day labour.' The reviewer has here pronounced the deepest possible condemnation of the system. No more cleaving curse, nor one that eats its way more deeply and ruinously into the moral stamina and character of a race than this can be conceived. A race of labourers so shut out cannot be expected to be self-reliant, or hopeful, or provident, or temperate. Such men, of course, must be pauperised; the very system which sets itself, by its restrictive policy, to prevent the increase of poor-rates, ensures the fact and the permanence of pauperism.

The contrary system cures pauperism at the root, as is well shown in the reviewer's paper. But it also benefits every class, not only the agricultural labourer, but all labourers, the small tradesman, the large farmer himself, and finally, and most of all, the landowner. All this has been abundantly proved by fifty years' experience in Dumfriesshire; is set forth in a conclusive pamphlet by an agriculturist of the very highest authority (Charles Stewart, Esq., of Hill Side); and is well epitomized in the *North British*. All that is wanted to make the result perfect is a system of free sale and cheap transfer of land, such

as has prevented pauperism in the Channel Islands, and extinguished it in Switzerland. A few peasant proprietors sprinkled among Mr. Stewart's leaseholders would complete the arrangement which at present we so much admire. And if the law of entail, and the sale and transfer of land were reformed, these results would follow without further legislation."—"Essays for the Times On Ecclesiastical and Social Subjects," pp. 392-396. ("Pauperism, Land Tenure, and the Clergy.")

I would particularly refer all who wish clearly and fully to understand this whole subject to the "Catechism on the English Land System," by Mr. C. Wren Hoskyns, M.P., and to Lord Napier and Ettrick's opening address at the last annual meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. (Report, 1872. Longmans & Co.)

CHAPTER III.

SCHOOL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

FEW subjects are more entirely misunderstood by the general public than the educational condition of the United States. In this chapter my object will be to say just so much as may be sufficient to set forth the general outline of the case truly, as respects popular education in the States, and especially to indicate the relations, usually of contrast, which exist between the educational problem in the States and the problem for this country. Those who wish to study the details of the matter will read Bishop Fraser's "Report on the Common School System in the United States," as rendered to the Schools' Inquiry Commission (1864); or, which will be better still, will be at pains to master some of the more important among the educational reports from the various States of the Union, which are to be found at South Kensington. What I aim at is not a full description, but an etching, clear and true if slight.

The characteristic feature of education in the States is the common school for each township, town, or district, chiefly maintained and entirely regulated by local authorities. It is important to bear in mind the origin of this now pervasive institution. It must

be remembered, then, that the "common school" of the States is not the result of national legislation. Although Congress has endowed the several States with land to be appropriated for educational purposes, it has never attempted either to organize, or even in any degree to regulate, education for the people, whether by way of schools or otherwise. There never has, in fact, been anything like a national system of education in the United States. I have before me the first report to Congress of the United States Commissioner of Education. Its date is 1868. Before that time there had not even been a National or Government Department of Education in any sense. In 1867, however, a measure was carried through Congress, which had been previously resisted and defeated, for establishing a Government Department. Its functions are, however, rigidly limited to "collecting statistics and facts" and "diffusing information." It has no administrative authority whatever. It has, in fact, no authority of any kind, not even to require information. The report for 1868 states that the department has "no organic connection with systems or institutions in the several States;" that there is "no authority to require, no pecuniary advantage in furnishing, no forfeiture for declining or neglecting to furnish, the information sought, and no means to supply the deficiency of written returns by personal inspection." It goes on to state that "at the present time there are no two States or cities in which the statistical returns, as published, include the same particulars, or between which a rigid comparison as to schools can be instituted; in more than one half the States the returns are so incomplete as to institutions, or omit so many vital points in the condition of the

schools returned, as to be worthless, as indications of the real work attempted or done in individual schools or by all the schools of the State ; *in nearly one half of the States no efficient system of public schools is in operation,* and no sufficient number of good private or denominational schools exists ; and, with a single exception (Rhode Island), no efficient measures are enforced by State or municipal regulations as to the non-attendance of children at some school, public or private, to stop the growth of absolute illiteracy, or diminish, by evening and adult schools, the still larger amount of practical ignorance of letters and books which abounds even in States where the most attention is paid to education." The Commissioner (the Honourable H. Barnard) further goes on to speak of the " amazing deficiencies in our systems, means, and methods of universal education," and of the " startling and humiliating statistics of the National Census of 1840, 1850, and 1860, as to the number of the white adult population unable to read and write in certain States, and for the whole country."*

Nor is the " common school " the creation of the several States. These States, as well as Congress, do indeed in many instances require the township, or district, or county to provide a requisite supply of " common schools," and also furnish some quota of aid, chiefly, I believe, from the revenue of land appropriations, towards the support of the schools. But they can scarcely be said to have any share in their organization or regulation further than in some cases to require that the school teacher should have a license from the local authority, and to indicate certain proportions or conditions according

* Report, pp. 11, 12.

to which their quota of help towards the school will be distributed. But these conditions neither prescribe the qualifications of the teacher nor affect the conduct of the school. If it is required that the teacher should be licensed by some local superintendent or other authority, no standard of examination is fixed, no previous training is required, neither is the amount of aid granted by the State, always very insignificant, made in any degree to depend on the results of an official inspection or examination of the school. The State is content with enjoining upon the town or township—or, in the case of a few of the States, as New York, on the county—to provide what schools may be necessary. But it leaves the mode of carrying out this requirement absolutely to the local authorities.

The common school is thus not the fruit of a national law or a national system, but of local necessities and local provision. The idea of the "common school" has been traced to an Act of the colonial legislature of Massachusetts in 1642, which enjoined upon the municipal authorities everywhere the duty of seeing that every child within their respective jurisdictions should be educated. But there is abundant evidence that the value of this law as a colonial statute was altogether insignificant. The detailed regulations came speedily to nothing; seem, indeed, scarcely to have had any force or authority from the first. What was vital in it was the principle, and this principle, among the original colonists whether of New England or of any of the early States, needed no enactment to give it weight. The "common school" may, indeed, be fairly said to have been spontaneous in its origin among the enlightened English colonists of North America. The "common

school" was, in fact, the rough and ready expedient by which, and by which only, it was possible to provide for the wants of the towns and the territories as the country filled and towns sprung up. It was so in the seventeenth century, it was more so in the eighteenth, and yet more so in the nineteenth. It was the obvious method of finding the readiest supply on the cheapest terms of a common want for societies predominantly of one class and character. Variety and multiplicity of schools was a luxury as impossible in the youth of such a country as America as any other fruit of old and high civilisation. All that could be hoped was to supply, with such teachers as could be had, often able, more often smart, but often also most incompetent, and very seldom trained to teach, the one school in each settlement, designed as it was for people virtually of one class or nearly so; and to support such schools out of a common fund. This was the cheap, the compendious, almost the only way of meeting the common want. An easy and costless method of maintaining the school and the teacher was also plain enough to all; it was to assign land out of the common possessions of the town or township for such maintenance. This, accordingly, was extensively done at first; although, owing to various causes, this method of support has, in later times, been in many instances changed. Here, then, we have explained to us the origin of the American common school, common and often free, always cheap, but, as a rule, imperfectly organized, and taught by untrained teachers.

I say "often free," for it is a mistake to suppose that the American common schools are universally free. In a considerable number of the States "rate-

bills" are still in general use. Not many years ago rate-bills, though not allowed in Massachusetts, were the general rule throughout the States. The State school fund, and whatever local taxation might be available, having contributed their quota of the expense, the remainder was levied by rate-bills, the expense being charged *pro ratâ* according to the number and attendance of scholars. A few years ago this system, mainly, I believe, through the efforts of the late Mr. Seward, was brought to an end in New York, and education in that great city was made universally free. A similar course has been taken in many parts of the Union.

At first, the common school was a strictly Church school, a school under the special charge and oversight of the clergyman of the parish, or township, and where the children were carefully instructed in the orthodox faith. In the early Puritan settlement the schoolmaster, if at all competent, was very highly thought of. The readers of Mrs. Stowe's "Old-Town Folks" will remember how in Old-Town the highly educated schoolmaster ranked next to the minister. It is not unlikely, indeed, that the great respect which, coupled often with very inadequate pay, is found still to attach throughout the States to the office of public school teacher, is derived in part from the old Puritan and Presbyterian feeling in regard to the schoolmaster, as a sort of Church officer, ranking often, if he were but learned, not far behind the minister in the consideration of the parishioners. Be this, however, as it may, it is certain that, in all the earlier period of the history of the States, the school was a strictly religious institution. The schoolmaster in the Presbyterian settlement taught, not only the

Scriptures, but the Assembly's Catechism; in the Episcopalian settlements he taught the Bible and the Church Catechism; among the Independents and the Quakers, he, at the least, closely instructed the children out of the Scriptures. So, for generations after the eastern States were settled—for many years, indeed, after the States achieved their independence—the common school of America was a strictly Christian school. The children were instructed in Scripture and orthodox doctrine. The strongly religious character of the common school in the United States, as originally instituted and organized, might, indeed, be safely inferred from the language used in the order of the General Court of Massachusetts respecting schools and education in the year 1647. The order begins in terms following:—"It being one chief project of the old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures, as in former times by keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these latter times by persuading them from the use of tongues, that learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers in the Church and Commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavours,—

"It is therefore ordered, that every township in this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint, &c."*

Bequests also were left in the early times of the colonies, for "gospel" and school purposes conjointly.

To this day the shadow of the old character is retained in a very large proportion of the schools; there is Bible reading, and some prayer—usually the

* Report of the United States Commissioner of Education, 1868, p. 327.

Lord's Prayer—commonly, also, the singing of a hymn. But the pressure of the "religious difficulty" (partly Unitarian, but mainly Roman Catholic) has made a great, and, in many respects, a sad difference, even in those schools which retain some form of religious teaching; while, in many cases, as at New York, it has led to the all but complete secularisation of the common schools. In almost all populous places it has placed the people in this dilemma, that they are compelled either to concede to the Roman Catholics their own denominational schools, or to reduce the Bible-reading in the common schools to a mere form, if not to give it up altogether. Still the American schools, up to the present time, have not been secular schools; the reverse has been the rule. So far as the "common schools" of the States have tended to form the national character, or to determine national progress, we must speak of these schools as they have been hitherto. Hitherto they have been, with comparatively few exceptions, Christian schools, Bible schools, schools not devoid of religious character and influence. The present and preceding generations of the people have been educated in schools of which it may be said that none were merely secular. When De Tocqueville visited the States, the religious character of the schools was marked. Since that time it has, in many instances, been gradually fading away. It may well be doubted whether the moral tone of the common schools in the States to-day, or of the national education generally, higher as well as lower, is nearly so good as at the time of the illustrious French philosopher's visit. One thing, moreover, is absolutely certain, that there neither has been, nor is likely to be, any "secular system" of schools in the

States; if for no other reason than this, that there is, and is likely to be, no national *system* of schools whatever. Except in Massachusetts and New York there appears to be hardly a shadow of even a State system, properly so-called, anywhere; and in Massachusetts there is, in reality, no State system. The State has no power to enforce any regulation on the towns or parishes; it can but recommend. Its grants of money are altogether trivial, and, trivial as they are, they are not made to depend on any conditions essential to the efficiency of the school instruction. The Massachusetts Board of Education admit that they "have no power whatever over the schools of the State," and that "all they can do is to regard their progress with watchful interest."* In New York State the county, and not the town, is the educational unit of area and autonomy, and the arrangements seem to be somewhat more bureaucratic, as Bishop Fraser says, than in Massachusetts; but there appears to be nothing whatever really in the nature of a State system, no organic or regulative unity whatever among the schools, or in the total school administration of the State, as such. In the city, of course, there is administrative unity.

This being the state of the case, schools in the States are likely to be secular or religious, according to circumstances. There are, in fact, though it seems almost like a contradiction in terms to say so, a number of Roman Catholic free and "common" schools in New York, and other cities of the Union, where there are dense masses of Irish Roman Catholics. Both in the City and the State of New York there have been, both recently and in earlier times,

* Fraser's Report, p. 59.

large appropriations both of land and of money to the educational institutions of Romanism. Similar appropriations have also been made to other denominations. The Baptists, it appears, receive a share. Nor are the appropriations to denominations always for primary schools. A year or two since New York State voted fifty thousand dollars to aid in the completion of a Wesleyan University at Syracuse, in the State of New York. Thus, among the common schools and colleges of the States, even the denominational principle, under special circumstances, occasionally crops up. But to this I shall have to recur presently.

It has been customary for persons to take the model schools of Boston, or of New York, as examples of the United States' national system; whereas they are quite exceptional, and only serve to illustrate the enlightenment and liberality of public educationists in these two cities. "Graded schools" are not the rule in the States, they are the rare exception. They are far from universal even in Massachusetts, although they may be nearly so in the city of Boston. Such schools, indeed, could hardly be the prevalent type of public elementary schools except for large towns. Nor is there really anything novel or original in the principle. All highly organized schools, which are steadily attended by successive generations of scholars, of necessity are "graded schools." The City of London School, for example, is a "graded school." Even our elementary schools in this country grow naturally and necessarily into graded schools as they become larger, and as the children become more regular in their attendance. Seven years ago, Bishop Fraser, in his report, explained that "the 'grades' correspond somewhat

to our 'standards' of examination." Within the last two years the regulations of the Privy Council have made systematic organization in classes according to "standards" a necessity in all our larger schools. The principle of separate class-rooms is also being applied in a rapidly increasing number of our elementary schools, and has long been applied in some. In the schools of the London School Board this principle is being largely carried out. The principle of fixed and separate teachers for the classes respectively is one which ought only to be carried out to a limited extent. In the case of the younger scholars our English pupil-teacher system, wisely applied, and with a due proportion of older teachers, is, by the confession of American educationists themselves, a much better system than theirs; in the case of older scholars the same teacher is often not competent equally or adequately to teach both on the literary and the scientific side. But, however this may be, the method of grading classes under a graduated arrangement of fixed teachers, one for each class, is a very ancient English system, exemplified in large public schools in this country from time immemorial. Under such a system I was myself educated for six years forty years ago, with the exception that, in the latter part of my time, experience led to the provision of two masters for several of the higher classes—one to take the languages, and another the mathematical work.*

On the system of graduation, both of classes and

* So, in the Swedish secondary schools, there may be, in the two highest classes, two or more teachers to each class. In the upper classes of the higher schools, at least, the instruction is apportioned among the teachers with regard to the subjects taught. The Swedish secondary school organization was settled in 1859.

of schools, provision is made in Boston, and an equivalent provision is made in New York, for common schools of three degrees—the primary, the grammar school, and the high school. If graded schools, however, throughout the States are exceptional rather than general, much more is grading in this its completest form—this graduation of schools—altogether exceptional. Even in Washington, according to the last published State report, there is no "high school." Very few of the towns of the States, indeed, outside of Massachusetts, except the very largest, have "high schools," a sort of school which corresponds with our superior grammar school, organized on a comprehensive modern basis. Many have not even a "grammar school," in addition to the primary school. The "grammar school" is a kind of superior commercial school, limited in its range to the ordinary branches of a good English education. Nor, even in New York and Boston, do more than a small fraction of the children pass onward through the grammar and high schools, or even through the grammar school. "One of the New York assistant-superintendents," says Bishop Fraser, "computes that *not more than half* of the children who attend the primary schools *ever enter the grammar schools;* and another states that a *considerable number do not even complete the primary course.*"* I see from the twenty-ninth report of the Board of Education for the City and County of New York (1870-71), that the number of primary scholars is returned as 130,705, while the number of scholars at the (merely English) grammar schools stands at 61,751, showing but a very slight improvement indeed during the half dozen years which have passed since

* Fraser's Report, p. 90.

Bishop Fraser's official visit and report. Even in Boston, undoubtedly the best educated city in the Union, the number who never pass beyond the primary stage, that is, who leave school at eight or nine, is very considerable, amounting, indeed, to one-fifth of the whole number year by year, only four out of five passing forward into the grammar school; while the number who, though they enter the grammar school, never complete their term in it, but leave to go to work at from ten to twelve years of age, must be very large indeed. In 1864 there were in Boston 32,854 children between five and fifteen; of these 24,617 were in average attendance at schools of all classes. But the average attendance at the three high schools of the city—Latin, English, and Girls'—was only 691. Similarly, as regards the model city, Philadelphia, the City Report on Schools for 1865 makes the instructive remark that, "while the high schools are deserving of every care as valuable institutions, we must not forget that out of the 75,000 pupils in the schools not more than 500 are received into these institutions per annum. The huge portion never see the interior of these schools; a very large number never get into the grammar schools; very many never reach a secondary school;" where it must be noted that a Philadelphian secondary school is simply an upper primary, corresponding partly to our second and partly to our third standard in English primary schools, a school, indeed, where the children are not carried in arithmetic beyond compound division.*

On the whole, the cases of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia—the most favourable cases which could be selected in a view of school education in the

* Fraser's Report, pp. 90-93.

United States—unite to establish the conclusion stated by Bishop Fraser in the following terms:—"It will be seen at once from these figures what a very small proportion of the number of children nominally educated under the common school system receives the complete education which that system contemplates; how many boys and girls must carry away with them into ordinary life no more knowledge than every boy and girl can carry away from an average efficient English elementary school; and that, if it be true, as it very likely is, that there are very few Americans who cannot read and write, there must be a considerable number who, in the way of literary accomplishments, can do nothing more."*

If this is the state of the case in the great cities, it may be conjectured how the matter stands in the rural districts. Graded schools are the rule in Boston, but not throughout the State of Massachusetts. And in the New England States generally the average condition of the rural schools is such as would be thought very discreditable in the country parishes of England. Vermont is a frugal and most reputable State, where much of the ancient New England steadiness and strictness survives among the people. Nevertheless, what is the condition of things in Vermont? The General Report for the year 1869 of the State Secretary of Education contains the following striking statements:—"About 1,600 of the 2,824 schools of the State have an average attendance of less than fifteen pupils; 800 of these 1,600 have less than ten; and not a small number have less than five in average attendance." The same document also describes as follows the general condition of things in

* Fraser's Report, p. 93.

the State :—" Here (in Vermont State) are over 2,000 little educational republics, practically independent of each other and all the world, a large number of them being remote from intellectual centres, and wedded to practices which were necessitated by sparseness and poverty in early times. They (the school districts) have been able to say to all projected improvements —'Keep off! we manage our schools in our own way; and if it is a poor way, it is a cheap one, and we mean to perpetuate it.'"

These extracts (they are literal extracts, incredible as they may sound) will serve to illustrate the truth of my assertion, when I said that in the United States there was neither a national system for the whole country, nor even a State system (properly to be so called) for the States severally. I may note here, in passing, that if the principle of local individuality and independence, for each township or district, does not work, it ought not to be for want of adequate looking after. The same official Vermont Report (1869) states that "the average number of individuals in each town who are school officers is from fifty to sixty. The whole number of school officers in the State is 12,000, or *more than one officer for every seven children.*"

Such being the condition of affairs in respect to the schools in Vermont, one can hardly be surprised at the educational results for the State, as exhibited in the same Report. The following extract will probably astonish some who have been accustomed to speak, or to hear others speak, broadly and loudly of the "system" of education in the United States, its universal excellence, and its results in producing the effective education of the whole people. But it exhibits,

notwithstanding, the unadorned and genuine truth as respects the frugal and reputable New England State of Vermont, which most who have any knowledge of America would have been disposed to regard as a model State:—"We claim," says the General Report, from which I have already quoted, "as a people, to take great interest in popular education, and in some sort we do. We boast much of our common schools, and with some reason. But if a part of the time spent in self-laudation were spent in efforts to improve their condition, we should be entitled to more credit, and our schools would be more efficient. A man by dint of rare native gifts and great industry and perseverance, with only the advantages of a common school education, rises to a leading position among men. We shout at once, 'See what the common school can do!' But this is no fair test of the efficiency of the common school. These men learned little more than to read poorly, and to write worse, at the common school. The true test is, what are our schools doing for the masses? Who does not know that a good reader among those who have attended our common schools is a rare exception? Who does not know that a great number of the children of Vermont have left its schools without the capacity to write a letter legibly and intelligibly? We speak of the rural districts, where the great mass of the children attend school, and where twenty-eight out of every thirty children in the United States are to be found. We need not rely upon the academies, seminaries, colleges, and universities, for the education of the people. Only one man in 150 is educated otherwise than at common school, and there is scarcely one in 1,000 that is educated at

a college. It is the daily public school, after all, which must fix the character and control the destiny of this Republic."

The view presented in the extract I have just given respecting Vermont is strongly confirmed, and at the same time evidence is afforded as to the condition of matters in another part of the Union, in the North-Western States, by the extract which I proceed to quote from the report of the Secretary of the Board of Education for the same State in 1868:—"An active and intelligent chaplain of the late war states that although a large proportion of the men from the North-Western States could read and write, many could read but very imperfectly, and composed a letter with great difficulty; many learned to write while in the army. The letter-writing showed many of the soldiers to be very imperfectly instructed in orthography. The same chaplain, comparing his experience with that of other chaplains, sums up thus:—'In a word, our soldiers in their education show that a great improvement is needed in our common schools.' No doubt the state of things is somewhat more favourable in Vermont, but there is not a county clerk in the State, before whom any considerable number of pension declarations have been made, who will not confess to having been amazed at the number of persons who have been before him as applicants or witnesses, who could not sign their names; and many of those who went through this form might as well have made their marks. Many who learn to write their names, learn to do no more."

The State of Maine is another of the New England States, neighbouring close upon Massachusetts, and may be regarded as nearly resembling in character

the country parts of Massachusetts. Any one would have said beforehand that this famous Temperance State could not but be one of the best educated, as it doubtless is one of the most careful, frugal, and generally moral States in the Union. Nevertheless the condition of education in this State, as described in authentic and conclusive State documents, written not by an English bishop, or by any foreign critic, but by State officials of grave responsibility and of long and intimate knowledge of the facts of the case, proves conclusively that the average character and condition of schools and of mere school education in the United States must be very low indeed, instead of being, as Englishmen so commonly suppose, very high.

One of the county supervisors or inspectors appointed to examine the condition of education in the State of Maine during 1869, and at the same time to contribute to its improvement, thus describes in his Report to the Secretary of the State Board of Education, the task which he found awaiting him in that capacity :—" I saw that the task of elevating our schools to any very high degree of excellence was one of herculean proportions. A radically defective school system, leading naturally to defective work in all directions, had resulted in a very general want of zealous, enthusiastic, and skilled labour on the part of teachers ; in a—to a very large extent—practically indifferent, or at least ineffective, system of supervision on the part of town superintendents ; and in a general want of interest among parents, so far as to manifest itself effectively for the bettering of schools ; and of these causes had been begotten a numerous and constantly increasing progeny of evils. School-

buildings, disgracefully mean and ill-furnished; schools, short, ill-attended, badly classified, frequently broken up by unruly pupils, with parental approval in many cases; school agents, almost universally remiss in duty, and superintendents the same in a large portion of the towns, and these often working the one against the other; agents striving for poor schools by the employment of cheap and unskilled workers, and superintendents who really were conscientious in the discharge of duty rightly refusing to certify such teachers; such is a faint picture of the outlook that presented itself when making a preliminary survey of the work to be done."

The following facts and figures taken from the Maine Report for the same year (1869) will serve to illustrate the statement I have just quoted. In this sister-state of Massachusetts, in Maine, there were 4,112 school districts, but only 184 graded schools, 4,019 school-houses, of which 2,136 were reported as in good condition, the remainder being, of course, the reverse; there were among the 4,000 teachers only 136 graduates of Normal Colleges—that is, teachers who had been properly trained; the number of school teachers returned was—male teachers, summer, 97; winter, 1,915; female teachers, summer, 4,033; winter, 2,200; while the average length per year during which all the schools were kept open was eighteen weeks five days! What a light do these figures throw upon the conditions of rural life, and the fashion of rural school-keeping, and the general ways and habits of school-teachers in the United States! But even in Massachusetts in 1864-5 the schools in fully one-fourth of the townships—in 87 townships—were kept open less than six months,

the law requiring them to be open, as a minimum, for six months. In 19 townships they were less than five, in several instances less than four months open.* In Ohio, during the same year, 340 townships sustained their schools less than twenty weeks, 203 less than sixteen, and 45 less than twelve.†

In fact, the large majority of the schools in the States, so far as I have been able to obtain any evidence on the subject, appear to be wanting in almost every condition which should belong to a national system of primary instruction. Of course, I say this broadly and generally, and without forgetting the fact that the common schools of Boston, and to a large extent, also, of New York, are among the best schools in the world, and that in some other towns, such as Cincinnati, the common school-system makes an approach to that of Boston or New York in excellence. After all, however, as the extracts which have been given show, and as might have been assumed beforehand, these schools of the larger and better towns form but a small fraction of the schools of the Union. Moreover, even in some of the largest and best towns—at all events in cultivated Philadelphia—as may be learnt from Bishop Fraser's Report, the primary common schools,—by far the most numerous and largely attended class,—are, or were, at any rate, at the time of his visit, and had been for years before, confessedly very inefficient.

Nothing is more certain, according to all that European knowledge and experience has taught—and American theory fully and emphatically confesses this truth—than that teachers should be trained for their profession. In the States, however, the

* Bishop Fraser's Report, p. 17. † Ibid., p. 51.

number of trained teachers is almost incredibly small, apparently not more than two per cent. Even in the Official Report for the City and County of New York, so recently as 1870-1, we read, "*were it possible to have all teachers properly trained for their duties,* before they are allowed to undertake the responsible work of teaching, and none but those who have given evidence of success while under training, ever employed, *the efficiency of our schools would soon become tenfold greater than it is at present.*" How late in the field is American training, at least, in New York, may be judged from the sentence which follows in the Report :—"That this training may be given, the Normal College has been instituted, and there is no doubt that the system will soon experience the good effect of its operations."

So backward, so wofully backward, in respect of training for candidates, is the American school system, even in the city of New York. What then is to be expected in the rural States and in the rural districts of all States ? Let us turn again to the old Puritan and New England State of Vermont, as affording a favourable sample of what is done in the way both of teaching and training, when compared with the generality of States, especially North-Western and Western. In that whole State there were, in 1869, two Normal Colleges, to supply teachers for its four thousand schools ; and the following particulars are given as to these two training schools or colleges, the one at Johnson and the other at Randolph, which are said to have been "in full and successful operation." It seems that at Johnson 108 females, and 42 males had been present for a longer or shorter period during the year. But the admissions to the

college are fresh every term, and there are four terms in a year. In the autumn of 1868 there were 70 students; in the winter term only 58; in the spring 104; in the summer only 19. It is evident that many of the students were only present a few weeks at the training college and few more than one term. In fact, of the 108 only 14 "graduated," as it is termed, 12 females and 2 males. At Randolph matters were much the same, making allowance for the difference in the numbers, which were for the four successive terms, 90, 47, 95, 23.

Vermont, however, is much better off than many of the States in having these two training colleges. What a view as to the state of public feeling in regard to the first requisite for effective popular education is afforded by the following statement, taken from the Report for enlightened Connecticut—one of the choicest New England States—for the year 1870. "One Normal School for training teachers had been *re-opened successfully after considerable opposition.* It had been closed for some years. *Including those who had only attended a ten weeks' course of lectures,* 130 teachers received instruction."

"Most States," says Bishop Fraser, "in which the common school system exists, *have* Normal Schools; but the number of students they supply is quite inadequate to the demand, and a large proportion do not stay long enough to graduate, but leave after a few months' residence to take charge of schools."* Massachusetts is the best supplied; it has four training colleges. Pennsylvania has three; New York State, with four or five millions of population, and some seventeen thousand teachers, had, till

* Report, p. 71.

lately, only one training college. Within the last three years a second for the City and County of New York has been established. The great State of Ohio has no training college. There is none in Columbia.

It is true that by the local laws of many of the States, all teachers employed in the State are required to be licensed or certificated, but the value of the certificate, in many instances, may be judged of from the following passages in State Reports. In Vermont a law had been passed in 1867, requiring teachers to be certificated under the hand of the Secretary of the Board of Education for the State. This piece of centralisation, however, was looked upon with little favour by a large number of the local authorities, and it was feared would be repealed. Some few local superintendents reported in favour of it, but the majority thought it either impracticable or undesirable. Several of the superintendents professed their desire to retain the power in their own hands. In support of the enactment the Secretary writes :—"Many of the better teachers are driven out of the schools by those of immature age and insufficient accomplishment, who underbid them. If the law is allowed to be rigidly enforced, it will sift our teachers, and secure a better grade. A large proportion of the town superintendents are totally incompetent to conduct an examination; others are men of sufficient capacity, but for years they have been unfamiliar with scholastic matters. But, however competent they may be, it requires a good deal of nerve for a man to deny the daughter of his friend a certificate, especially if the parent of the child should chance to be a member of his parish, or on the list of his patients, or to be trading at his store."

The Reports of the various town superintendents in Vermont are exceedingly suggestive. One says, as to the teachers under his superintendency, "nearly all the teachers have had experience, several having taught from ten to fifteen terms, and one as many as twenty-five terms. Such teachers magnify their office." But many describe a very different condition of things. One says, "Our teachers are too short-lived; we have nearly as many different teachers as terms of school." Others testify as follows:—"With a few interesting exceptions, the teachers work as if they were performing a task, or completing a routine of unpleasant services which they will be glad to see completed." "Persons have been licensed to teach who were hardly qualified to teach the English alphabet." "Most of those professing to teach in our district schools have not been thoroughly taught the elementary principles of the English language, nor of those other branches they attempt to teach. Some, who have professedly taught for years, are very deficient in their knowledge of the simplest elementary principles which ought to be taught to very small children." "A majority of teachers are unqualified for teaching school. Many teachers can hardly write their names so as to be read, and yet we employ them in the common schools."

What I am about to quote from the Report for 1868 (still for Vermont) shows how great a necessity there was for adopting the law passed in 1867, but which had not come into operation as yet in the case described in the quotation, by which law the secretary, instead of the town superintendent, was required to give the license or certificate to the teacher.

"A woman commenced school in one district, this winter, without coming to me for a certificate, and progressed several weeks—then applied for a certificate. She had taught, she said, nine terms, and appeared slightly indignant that I questioned her. I asked her to pronounce a line of the a-b, abs; she failed. Asked her a simple question in arithmetic; failed. Asked her to describe Mississippi River and its principal branches and principal city on each; failed. She worked hard in school, gave perfect satisfaction in the district—and I thought I was obliged to lie and certify to her ability to teach, and did so."

All this, it must be remembered, refers not to a new State, or backwoods State, not to a Western or North-Western State, but an excellent superior New England State, to old-settled and virtuous Vermont.

Complaints of the same general nature as these which come with so sharp a point from Vermont, are, Bishop Fraser testifies, universal. From New York, in particular, they are very emphatic. The standard of examination seems to vary indefinitely. The examining authority, also, varies continually in the different States. In Massachusetts, it is the School Commissioner of the town or township; in New York State and Illinois it is the District School Commissioner; in Ohio, it is the County Board.*

The root of the whole evil is no doubt to be found in the all but absolutely local standard and government of the schools. Local influences altogether predominate. Even in Massachusetts the following complaints were officially recorded in the State Report for 1865:—"Ties of blood, friendship, or caprice

* Fraser's Report, p. 70.

often decide in the employment of a teacher." "The practice of employing a relative or particular friend to teach is, we fear, becoming a growing evil." "Some prudential agents [District Managers] have maintained that their favourite teacher has a right to keep the school, *whether she obtains a certificate from the School Commissioner or not, provided that the majority in the district want her.*"*

The quotations I have given from the Maine Reports show how extremely few are the graded schools, how scarce the trained teachers, how discreditable a large proportion of the school-houses, how incredibly brief the average yearly period of school attendance in that State.

In Connecticut, one of the smallest but most enlightened, and, indeed, cultivated States in the Union, and one possessing a remarkably large State fund for education, in which, too, is situated Yale College, and Middletown University (Methodist Episcopal Church), matters are not greatly better. The number of common schools in the State is 1,647, of which 118 consist of two departments, primary and grammar school. Only 99 include the superior grade, or "high school." Many of the school-houses in this high-class State are "palatial," many more are good. Still only one-half of the school-houses are reported as "good;" while one-sixth, or rather more, are reported as "poor." The description of the worst sort of school-houses or "school-huts" is striking—"badly located, in damp, unhealthy flats, near railroads, factories, or drinking saloons, without any playgrounds or suitable offices, with but one entrance for boys and girls, narrow and low-ceiled, ill-ventilated,

* Fraser's Report, p. 33.

and without blinds or curtains" (a very serious deficiency in the States). "In a few cases the desks consist of long boards around three sides of the room, while three planks fronting them supply all the seats for the larger scholars, and a similar and shorter row of planks, nearer the box-stove in the centre, serve for the younger children."

In this State there is, as I have already observed, a small Training College, recently reopened, many of the students in which were fitted for their work by a ten weeks' training.

It thus appears, from the evidence of American officials themselves, that the "graded schools" of the States, instead of being characteristic of what is called the "American system," are the rare exception among the "common schools," and not the rule; that, instead of American teachers being on system trained for their work, very few indeed of them have ever received any training at all, even in the best and oldest New England States, which are confessedly much in advance, educationally, of the great majority of the States; we have seen what a teacher's license or certificate is often worth; we have had evidence, also, in passing, as to the irregular, the most irregular, attendance of children at the schools. On this point I propose to offer at this point some further evidence.

It is often said that school attendance in the States is compulsory. This is so, as respects the letter of the law in some few of the States, chiefly the New England States and New York; and some attempt is made in Rhode Island, and also, I believe, though not so strenuously, in Boston, and one or two other towns of Massachusetts to carry out the law. But

even in Massachusetts, although the attendance there at school is good up to the age of nine or ten, compulsion, as Bishop Fraser has shown, is not really carried out. The people, in fact, are not prepared to submit to it. On an average, school attendance in the States appears to be decidedly worse than in England. In what part of England could anything in the way of irregularity of school attendance be found to equal what has been noted in regard to Maine, where the average school year of all the schools in the State taken together is only eighteen weeks five days? Ten weeks' training for teachers in Connecticut, and eighteen weeks' school year in Maine, are facts which agree fairly with each other. It is evident that some of the Maine schools cannot be open more than three or four weeks in the year, just so long probably as the "district" share in the State School Fund will serve, without any local tax, to pay an amateur teacher who happens to be out of a situation. Others will be kept open for three months in winter, or for three in summer, according to circumstances, others for two terms of three months each. In this way the average of the whole is brought to eighteen weeks five days.

But leaving Maine and its farmers, let us turn to New York. The last Report informs us that there were in the City and County of New York 239,764 scholars on the rolls of the public schools, with an average attendance of 103,822. London can show nothing so loose or irregular as this. The New York State Report for 1869-1870 calculates that the average attendance of scholars throughout the State is not one-third of the number of children and young people within the school age. The limits of school

age, however, in this statement are taken as five and twenty-one years. But, if five and sixteen or seventeen had been taken as the limits, the result would have been still very unsatisfactory. The school age throughout the States begins several years later, and is continued correspondingly later than in this country. The State Report gives the proportion of daily average school attendance in the following cities of the State as follows:—In Albany 28 per cent.; Brooklyn, 30; Buffalo, 47; Hudson, 34. In Plattsburg village, Clinton county, there is a complete group of graded schools, four primary schools, a grammar school, and a high school. Nevertheless, the total number of children of school age being 1,975, and the number whose names were placed on the books during the year being 875, the daily average was only 389.

In Connecticut, three years ago, the total number of children of school age was 125,407; the average attendance in summer was 56,309, in winter 64,707. Between 9,000 and 10,000, however, were taught in private schools. The State Secretary of Education for Vermont, in his General Report for 1869, says that "the evil resulting from non-attendance and irregularity of attendance and tardiness is alarming." He turns aside, however, to show that, however serious this evil may be in Vermont, it is at least as great and serious elsewhere throughout the States; and he proceeds to make his point good by the following statement: "The City of New York enrols 222,000 school children, yet the average attendance is less than 92,000.* In Philadelphia 20,000 neither

* This statement does not harmonise with the one I have quoted from the New York City and County Report for 1870-1871: it must refer, however, to the year 1868.

attend school nor are engaged in any useful employment. Only about one-half of the 45,000 children of school age in Chicago are enrolled in the public schools. Of those whose names are on the list, so many are habitually absent from school that 14,000 seats are ample for the accommodation of those in attendance. *Of the scholars present on any given day not more than one-third occupy seats during more than nine weeks in the year, and scarcely more than one-fifth of the remainder are regular in attendance.*"

Vermont, notwithstanding the complaints of its Secretary for Education, is certainly in a much better position than the cities to which he refers, and better than the country generally. Of the children in Vermont, between four and eighteen, all but an exceedingly small fraction attend school some time or other during the year. During the weeks also that the schools are open the average attendance is 72 per cent., which is very good for America. But the great evil in Vermont is that many of the schools are open but a few months in the year ; the teachers, also, being often incompetent.

Bishop Fraser found the average attendance of the children enrolled on school lists in six leading States, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York, to be 70 per cent. ; and in eight great cities, viz. Boston, Newhaven, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, Brooklyn, and New York, to be 58 per cent. The average attendance of the school children in the ten specimen districts of England which were specially reported upon under the Duke of Newcastle's commission was 76 per cent. In Mr. Winder's manufacturing district the

average was 82 per cent.,—higher than in favoured Massachusetts, where the average is 80 per cent. In taking note of the American figures, moreover, the important fact cannot be forgotten that a large per centage of the schools are open not more, that many are open less, than six months in the year.

I shall not further pursue the details of the States' system. There is no general view of the whole subject throughout all the States attainable, for the reasons so clearly stated in the Report of the United States' Commissioner, quoted by me at the beginning of this chapter. To read and analyse all the State Reports on the subject would be an immense undertaking and labour thrown away, if they were within reach. But they are not accessible. The details I have given are chiefly taken from the Reports of some of the most cultivated and enlightened States and cities of the Union; States and cities which, taken together, cannot but afford a most favourable view of the case. I have quoted most largely from the Reports of the New England States, the seats of the oldest civilisation and of the highest and best education. It has been seen what the general result is as regards those States. The inference must be that the average educational condition of the Union is decidedly worse than that of the States and cities which have chiefly passed in review—Massachusetts, Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, and New York, and such cities as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. "Pure American democracy of the best type," says Bishop Fraser, "is not to be found in the cities and hives of industry, not in New York or Philadelphia, or even in Boston; but in States like Vermont, the Arcadia of the Union, or in districts like the western counties of Massa-

chusetts. It is emphatically a New England product, and a product of New England country life. A Massachusetts gentleman wrote to me in these words just before I left for home. 'I wish you could have come here, where we still linger, to see the true, characteristic, simple New England life. It would have given you certainly some pleasure to see so healthy, happy, and promising a community—promising, I mean, for the future, as already exhibiting a higher type of civilisation than is found elsewhere in a community of equal size.'" *

My readers have had an opportunity of seeing what is the educational condition of Vermont, "the Arcadia of the Union," and of other leading States of New England, where the highest "type of" American "civilisation" is to be found. Nothing can be better established than the conclusion, that, so far as the provision and quality of elementary schools is concerned, and so far as school attendance is concerned, the educational condition of the United States is much inferior to that of England. The Reports of the States also prove that, as respects school books and school furniture, the superiority lies altogether, on the whole, on the side of England. The model schools indeed, what I might almost call the show schools, of the great cities, such as New York and Boston, are undoubtedly superior in their appointments, and are probably equal in the quality of their teaching, to the best public schools which as yet have been established in England. It is the worthy ambition of these great and public-spirited towns to have the best schools in the world, and no pains or expense is spared to make their schools such. But

* Report, p. 169.

the schools of a country cannot be judged by the rare exceptions, they must be judged by the rule and the average. So judged, American schools, as a whole, are, as I have said, decidedly inferior to those of England. Complaints as to deficiency of furniture and inadequate and inferior supply of school books are very common in the Reports, and not very seldom reveal a really lamentable condition of things. Some pretty strong intimations of the actual state of affairs are contained in extracts I have already given from the Reports for Maine and other States. In the Western and some of the North-Western States matters are much worse. What, indeed, can be expected in the way of school furniture or school books in the case of schools which are only open—as a very large proportion of American schools are only open—from four to seven months in the year, and which are taught by mere amateur teachers, who have found as yet nothing more remunerative to do, not often by the same teacher for two terms together, very rarely for three, scarcely ever for all the four terms of the year? There are far more schools of this description in the States than there are of the good Boston or New York type.

It has been seen that a very small fraction of the school teachers in the States have been trained. Let us understand what this means. It means that they have neither been to a college nor been apprenticed, probably not even at any time been monitors; it means that they have received, for the most part, no thorough instruction at all even as scholars. It has been seen how valueless often is the examination they must undergo, and the license or certificate they receive. Most of the American teachers take to teaching either

as an interlude in life, in the case especially of female teachers, or as a *pis aller*, until they can obtain a better situation. The institution of pupil-teachers has not yet been established in the States, although enlightened educationists would greatly like to see it established.

It will at once be evident, on consideration, that schools which are vacant through so large a portion of the year as the American schools (apart from the large towns), and are taught by mere teaching "casuals," alighting for a few months at the school, and knowing nothing of their profession, cannot either be well furnished or in any respect well appointed.

The only labour that is highly paid anywhere is either skilled labour or labour that demands immense physical power and exertion. The average teacher's work in the States is neither of these. Hence it is naturally very poorly paid. The school teacher, much more often a young woman of from seventeen to twenty-two, than an older person, or than a young man, is frequently a friend or relative of one or more of the school managers. It is quite a common thing in the country townships for the teacher, male or female, to receive a very slender salary—for cost of clothes and pocket-money—and to board round at the houses of the farmers or trades-people in the township. This is a pleasant, homely way of managing matters, but it is hardly proper to a highly developed and first-class educational system, such as so many have imagined the American "school system" to be.

Those who have held up the States "system," so called, to English admiration and imitation have been ill-informed Englishmen. Candid and well-informed Americans take a very different tone. Last autumn the

Rev. Dr. Cummings, Principal of Middletown University, Connecticut—himself an American Episcopalian Methodist—was on a visit to England, and was led, in consequence of a series of papers by my friend and colleague, the Rev. G. O. Bate, on National Education in the United States,* to address two letters to the editor of the *Watchman* on the subject under discussion. In his first letter (which appeared in the *Watchman* for October 23rd) he says, among other things, "In the United States no national system of education exists, or is practicable." "Laws enforcing attendance at school have been enacted by some of the States, but they are repugnant to American ideas, and are only partially enforced." "In most cases a teacher is employed only for a single term." In his second, he comments on certain views disparaging to English education and highly laudatory of the States' schools and school-education as "preposterous." He adds, "Moreover, it would be about as correct to affirm that the school described in the 'Hoosier Schoolmaster' represents the schools of New England as to state that the Massachusetts school system is a fair representation of what prevails in many of the States." "The success of the American system must depend largely on the intelligence and public spirit of the people in the towns and school districts; where these are wanting, there must inevitably be poor schools; on the other hand, where these abound, the flexibility of the system and the power given to local boards of officers will secure better schools than a rigid national or State system. In many respects there is a similarity between the

* I have been greatly indebted to these letters in the present chapter.

best State and the English system of education, but where they differ I see no prominent feature of the American system that with advantage could be introduced into England. I have read the Education Act and have sought other means of information, and I find much in the English system to admire, and I have no disposition to recommend American modifications. I regard as among its best features the giving so much power to the Department of Education and to the School Boards. It is a power unknown in the United States." "It seems to me that it would be highly unwise to attempt to introduce the same system of education into the United States and England." *

In conversation with myself, Dr. Cummings expressed his strong approval of the English pupil-teacher system. So also it appears that Bishop Fraser, in his official visit of inquiry to the States, found the two great features of our system which most excited the envy of educationists to be our thorough-going system of Government inspection and examination, accompanied by "payment for results," and "our course of nine years' training of teachers," as pupil-teachers, as college students, and as teachers under probation. † Dr. Cummings, having himself had practical experience as a teacher in elementary as well as higher subjects, laid particular stress on the value of our pupil-teacher organization in regard to the discipline and practical working of a school. It is indeed evident that, even apart from proper college training, the practical training of pupil-teachers, in well-organized schools during a term of

* *Watchman* Newspaper, November 20th.
† Fraser's Report, p. 50.

apprenticeship, would effect a great improvement in American schools. In the States, where education universally begins and ends at a considerably later age than in England; and where, also, school teachers would be, and indeed have been, drawn from a superior class of the population as compared with the usual sources of teacher supply in England, among other reasons because the public school in America is a "common school" in which all classes but the most wealthy and refined are more or less represented, and because the common school-teacher enjoys an hereditary position of respect, as in Scotland, derived from the very times of the foundation of the States as British colonies; in the United States, under such educational conditions, pupil-teachers would naturally, and with great advantage, be apprenticed at a later age than in this country, perhaps at fifteen, certainly not earlier than fourteen; and the apprenticeship would not need to be for more than three years. Smart as Americans are, whatever may have been the defects of their school education, three years' apprenticeship would go a long way towards preparing them to be really good and effective teachers, although nothing could compensate, on the broad scale, and with a view to thorough work in all departments of education, for the want of regular training in a Normal College, with first-class practising schools.* If American teachers, as a class, were both apprenticed to their profession and properly trained by tutors and professors, nothing is hazarded in saying that they would soon be the most effective teachers in the world.

* Many of the Training Colleges n the States have no practising schools connected with them.

As it is, in most of the schools of the United States there is but one teacher for all the children, without any aid whatever, except such monitorial help as he may be able to extemporise. Not "graded schools," but schools in which half-a-dozen classes, of all ages from five to fourteen, are under the care of a single and solitary teacher, in one ill-appointed room, where, in some cases, there is not even a black board, are the ordinary type of common school in the United States.

While such a condition of things is allowed to continue,—and local independence, township or district educational republicanism and autonomy, would not seem likely soon to pass away in the States, or to permit the general enforcement of a better system,—it is impossible that anything like our pupil-teacher organization can be generally adopted in the States. Everything is against it. Very few of the acting school-teachers have themselves received any specific training. The untrained teachers being, partly as a consequence of their want of training, very poorly paid, take up the work of teaching only as a make-shift, and speedily forsake it when they find the opportunity of obtaining more remunerative employment, many of the male teachers, indeed, having undertaken to keep school merely as a means of supplementing their earnings from other sources, often from manual labour. The untrained and casual teacher, accordingly, seldom in a school for two terms together, can take no charge of pupil-teachers, however sorely the school may need their help. Besides which, as we have seen, there are often long intervals in the year during which the "common school" of the district is not even open. It is evident that the

pupil-teacher system could not be brought into ordinary or extensive operation where such conditions as these commonly obtain.

The want of such a system, however, whilst it leaves the country school, under its one ever-changing teacher, quite inefficient, makes the cost of maintaining an efficient graded town school to be very great. Every teacher is an adult, and, in the case supposed, of an efficient town school, must have had some training, more or less, or at least some continuous experience. The teachers, in short, must be adult skilled teachers. Such teachers in the States, although it cannot be said that they command high salaries, for skilled teaching power is paid at a much lower rate than in England,—doubtless because the competition of the unskilled multitude of casual teachers keeps the rate of payment down,—nevertheless must be fairly paid. On a system accordingly which requires that a school shall be organized throughout in separate classes, each one of which is under a teacher of ability and experience, the total charge to the community of an efficient primary school must be very great, especially as the schools, in most of the large towns, are all free schools. In Boston, New York, and other large, wealthy, and public-spirited towns, the community will provide and support such schools ; their schools are among the best in the world. But ruder, less wealthy, less highly organized communities, cannot be expected to do any such thing, and, as a matter of fact, do not. The average country school of the States, the average school, indeed, of all but the good towns, is as ill-appointed and inefficient as the graded school of the high-class town is in every way well-found and effective.

It is evident enough from a review of the whole case, that the absolute local independence of the many thousands of small educational republics which make up the general aggregate of school provision and administration in the States is the real source of the evils so graphically described and so earnestly complained of by school superintendents and by secretaries of education throughout the towns and states of the Union. What is needed is in every State an effective general system, thoroughly enforced, but at the same time allowing, under its prescribed general principles and outline, of sufficient local varieties and adaptation, and of the play of individual energy and ability,—a system co-extensive with the State, bringing alike town, and village, and country district, under one pervasive administration. Such a system ought to require every school-teacher to have been trained, in accordance with prescribed general conditions, or, if not college-trained, to have been articled or apprenticed as a pupil-teacher or school-assistant, and to have passed an examination of a public and duly competitive description. It ought to combine and incorporate a system of pupil-teacher apprenticeship, training, and examination, with the other educational arrangements and requirements of the State. If such a plan as this were carried out through the States, the remuneration of the school-teacher would be very greatly raised; the profession would rise in every way; and American school-teachers would probably, in a few years, be far superior as a class to any other national body of public school-teachers. But this cannot be accomplished except by means of large and important State grants made conditionally to all "common schools,"

the conditions being that the teachers shall be trained, the teaching staff, including a proper quota of pupil-teachers, adequate, and the results of examination satisfactory. The State would have to appoint the inspectors and regulate all examinations. The large State grant would be the lever, the only possible lever, by means of which any such change in the actual condition of the schools and of school administration in the States might be brought about. Of such a consummation there would seem to be no prospect whatever at present.

I must not omit to note one deficiency in the American provision of schools. As a rule, there are no infant-schools. Till lately, infant-schools have been quite unknown. Children, indeed, are not supposed to go to school until they are five years old. With that age the recognised attendance at the common school begins. Some, indeed, may doubt, from the accounts of juvenile precocity in manners, habits, and dress, of which we often read in American papers, or extracts from such papers, whether there are any children in America fit to be classed as infants after they have learned to walk. In reality, however, the absence of infant-schools is probably to be accounted for from the pervasive comfort and superiority of home-life among the American people, as compared with the masses of our English population. Middle-class people in England do not often send their children to an infant-school. In the States there are no classes, except the improvident masses, mostly of foreign derivation, in the large towns, which, in general character, in comfort, decency, self-respect, and adequate means of support, fall below our English lower middle-class. Nevertheless, infant-schools are

a great power, are really good for the children of the well-to-do classes as well as of the poor, are full of happy instruction and entertainment, beautifully combined, for young children, and greatly facilitate their acquisition of knowledge and culture in the after departments of education. In Philadelphia, and elsewhere, voluntary infant-schools have, during late years, been established in the States. Our own English Home and Colonial Training College and practising schools have furnished the model for these American institutions. It may be anticipated that, before long, their very great value may come to be universally appreciated; and their absolute necessity to be understood, for such towns as New York, if the children of the ignorant and degraded classes are to be thoroughly rescued from their natural associations and habits, to be reclaimed early, as they need to be and must be, in order to be reclaimed thoroughly, and to be trained into all the habits of virtuous and self-respecting citizens. But infant-school teaching, pre-eminently, is a part of educational science; and of teaching, as a science, little comparatively is known, among either the teachers or the people of the States.

Such is school education in the United States. As a whole, it is inferior; inferior in all respects to that of this country. As respects Normal Colleges and training, the qualifications and supply of teachers, the school-rooms, their furniture and appointments, and the regularity of school attendance, public elementary education in the States falls below the English elementary public school system. And yet the citizens of the States are, on the whole, more intelligent and better educated, as a matter of fact,

than the people of this country. Here is an apparent contradiction which must be explained before I close this chapter. No doubt this very fact has gone far to produce the impression that the school education of the States must be thoroughly effective. The fact that school education is but one, and hardly the most important, among many factors which go to determine the condition of a people as to education and intelligence, is a point which has been but little apprehended, and very rarely taken account of, in the educational comparisons that have been made between people and people. Hence most persons have naturally connected the schools and school system of Boston, of which travellers have said so much, with the actual condition of the whole American people, as to education and general intelligence; they have inferred that Boston schools were a sample of all American schools, and that the superior intelligence of the people was to be traced to the admirable school provision.

That this is by no means the case, will, by this time, I hope, have been made plain. From my two former chapters, also, it will probably be gathered that the actual condition of the American people, as to education and general intelligence, is due mainly to other causes and influences than any connected with their schools.

Let me, however, explain in what sense I speak of the superior information and intelligence of the American people. I mean to say that in average available intellectual power, in the combination of intellectual readiness and activity, with so much knowledge as is needful for each man to make the best of his business opportunities, and push his way

in life, the people of the United States are, on the whole, superior to any other people. They are, on an average, superior in practical business knowledge and ability. Not all, indeed, but nearly all are able at least to read the daily local paper with competent intelligence, to write so far as is necessary to them in business, and to count and calculate to the like extent. If their way opens to rise in life, or to advance and increase their business scope, they have so much intelligence and mental energy as to be able to advance and improve their own knowledge to a proportionate and adequate extent. In this sense, and to this extent, the Americans are, very generally, an educated people ; and, on the whole, are not a little superior to our own nation. At the same time, really high culture is rarer among them than among us ; really sound and wide knowledge, extending beyond the limits of their own business and their own town and State, or, at most, their own country, is comparatively seldom to be met with. The proportion of Englishmen who, in such a sense as I have now indicated, are well and thoroughly educated, is larger than of American citizens. And I need hardly add that, as respects all sorts of knowledge and mental culture, except merely practical business knowledge and altogether elementary general knowledge, the average knowledge and culture of the people of the United States must be placed far below that of Switzerland and the foremost German States.

Indeed, the amount of actual illiteracy in the States is far larger than appears to be generally known in this country. As is intimated by Mr. Barnard, the Commissioner of Education, in the extract from his Report quoted by me at the beginning of this chapter,

the successive censuses of the States in 1840, 1850, 1860, showed a gradual increase in the proportion of home-born white Americans who can neither read nor write. The number returned in 1860 was 871,418; the number of foreign-born illiterate white adults being 346,893. Horace Mann, the distinguished American educationist and statistician, "asserts," as Mr. Hepworth Dixon informs us, "that these returns are far below the facts. He takes some pains to show that many persons are returned as able to read and write, who are not able."* He concludes that the real number is 40 per cent. larger than the number returned. In Ohio, 41,000; in Illinois, 38,000; in Pennsylvania, 36,000, are returned as unable to read and write. Singularly enough, the number of illiterates in these States is larger than the number in New York State (36,000), which receives into itself so much Irish ignorance and poverty.

Nevertheless, no one can deny, and I have no care, on any account, to extenuate the superiority to England of the United States in respect of general intelligence and mental force.

The reason, however, of the superior intelligence and information of the people of the States is not to be found in the superiority of their schools, but in the superiority of the conditions, domestic, social, and political, in which, as a people, they grow up, and have grown up, generation after generation, from the first founding of the States as colonies. There has never been a stratum of hereditary pauperism or semi-pauperism lying at the base of the great American nation. The people,—always excepting the incongruous immigrant crowds of low foreigners, chiefly

* "The Switzers," p. 301.

Irish, that load and litter the streets of such cities as New York and Philadelphia, and whose case, most nobly grappled with, is yet found as perplexing and difficult to deal with as that of the corresponding classes in this country,—has always been made up of respectable, self-respecting, well-to-do families, amenable to Christian principles and motives. Let it be remembered that the States have throughout been peopled by free and enterprising emigrants; that such founders as the Puritan pilgrims or the gentlemen of Virginia were the first settlers; that much of the best energy and self-reliance of Europe has found its home and its field of labour in the States; that a whole continent, matchless for its magnificence and its resources, has been available for the endowment with land, and the settlement in homely comfort and frugal wealth, of the hardy immigrants who flocked to its territory; let it be remembered that whilst the wonderful commercial facilities and resources of the country, with its vast seaboard and its immense arterial system of natural navigation, by river and lake, added to its unbounded wealth of fertile land, are filling the country with great cities, full of irrepressible life and insatiable enterprise, at the same time the unlimited facility in all the States, and in all but the latest stages of town growth in the largest towns, of acquiring land, has made all classes, as a rule, the artisan no less than the merchant, the hired field hand as well as his employer, either to be in possession or in clear expectancy of possessing houses and land-plots of their own; let it be remembered that American citizens grow up, from the earliest period of their lives, surrounded with every means, motive, and incentive to the acquisition of

knowledge and the exercise of intelligence that can be brought to bear on the development of a nation ; and it will easily be understood that school education is comparatively a much less important element and factor in regard to the total education and actual intelligence and mental power of the people in the United States than in the case of England, or indeed of any other nation in the world.

The American child is born into a reading, intelligent family, conversant with the history and politics of the country, with business, with all that belongs to civil and social life ; is born, also, into a thriving, active, self-reliant community ; is born into the midst of thoughtfulness, of moral and mental energy, of practical shrewdness and experience ; he sees everybody reading the papers every day, and hears everybody talking of them ; he is taught from the very first that the success of each person in his life depends solely on his own energy and self-reliance. He is surrounded, from the very first, with all the infinite activities of the most exuberant commercial and political life that the world knows ; and he has an open pathway before him from the first. Such conditions of life as these enable a youth to rise in the commercial and social scale with a *minimum* of school education. In England the school education, in the case of many children, is the one means by which alone they can hope to force their way onward and upward, in spite of all home disabilities and hindrances, and of the pressure of a mountain-load of social burdens and difficulties which lie upon them overhead. In the States, all that is wanted for the kite to rise and fly is just the first lift ; all that is needed for the lad is education enough to read the

papers, to calculate a simple account, and to take his first situation. The rest will follow, if he has but push and energy. So the tailor or the rail-splitter may rise to be the President of the United States.

Well does Bishop Fraser say that "in estimating the aggregate result of the various influences which combine to form the character and develop the intellect of the American people, we must let our eyes range beyond the walls of the school."* He proceeds, accordingly, to refer to the press, to lectures, and to political and public life, as great educating agencies. "The Americans," as he says, "are emphatically a reading people." All ranks and classes read; all read the daily paper; all are "posted up" in current events; most read more or less of light literature; not a few read the best standard works in the language. The best writers of England, it is well known, have more readers in America than at home. Of lectures the educational influence in the States is probably of doubtful value. But there can be no doubt as to the immensely stimulating effect on the American intelligence of the political and public life of the country.

The phenomena of national life in the States are well described by Bishop Fraser: He speaks of "the restlessness and activity of the American character,—without, perhaps, the culture and refinement of the old Athenian, but with all his versatility; the absorbing interest of political life; the constantly rising aims of each individual; the ebb and flow of commercial enterprise, and the immense development of the spirit of speculation; the intense energy of the national temperament, its rapidity of movement, its precipi-

* Fraser's Report, p. 197.

tancy, its impatience of standing still."* Life in such a nation can hardly be dull or slow; intelligence can hardly be inert. The mental soil is quick and fruitful, and a little knowledge goes a long way. Hence arises one of the most distinctive educational forces of the States, which makes itself felt in the schools as well as elsewhere. The people have a natural gift of teaching, of impressing others with what they mean, of forcible and picturesque, often very homely, illustration. One consequence of this is that American teachers, even when untrained, are rarely stupid; they may be grossly ignorant, but they are still smart. Had they, as a class, but knowledge and training, as they have faculty and aptitude, they would, as popular and elementary teachers, be, as I have already said, almost unrivalled.

I must not bring this chapter to a close without referring, however briefly, to the voluntary schools of various sorts, some merely private, some denominational, which are scattered throughout the States. There are not a great many denominational schools besides Roman Catholic schools, of which, however, there are large numbers, especially where the Roman Catholics are gathered together in masses among the population of large towns, such as Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and New York. In some instances, as I stated, grants of public money have been made to the Roman Catholic schools. Denominational schools of all classes, however, seem to be somewhat on the increase, owing to the growing complaint as to the absence of religious tone, and of moral power and discipline, in the common schools. Private schools exist in large numbers, and are increasingly multi-

* Fraser, p. 167.

plied, particularly in the older States and cities. Society, as it develops, begins to require, even in the States, more variety of school provision. "The system" (of common schools), says Bishop Fraser, "works with a much nearer approach to its *idea* or theoretic perfection in the country, where ranks are more equalised, and there is no one rich and no one poor, than it does in the cities and towns. Yet even in country districts 'aristocratic feelings' and prejudices, very foolishly and unhappily, it must be admitted, are beginning to prevail. And in all the cities, New York, Newhaven, Hartford, Providence, and even in Boston, the wealthier class, indeed, all who can afford to do so, almost without exception, send their children to private schools. Of the persons whose acquaintance I made in the country, most of whom I should rate at about the same level of social rank and social feeling as myself" (an English parish clergyman), "I do not remember one who used either for sons or daughters the common schools. In all these cities there are finishing schools for young ladies, just as there would be in cities of the same character among ourselves; and there are private day or boarding-schools for boys, at which they remain till they are fit for college. Scholars from the common schools who go up to a college generally finish off their preparation for college by passing a year at a private school."*

We must expect to see these voluntary schools increase and multiply in the large and growing towns of the United States of the future. I find, as I shall have occasion more particularly to note in a subsequent chapter on "Free Education," that in

* Fraser's Report, pp. 99, 100.

some quarters a demand is arising that all such schools should participate the State bounty, in some form or other, that, on the principle of payment for well-tested results, they should receive a certain proportion of aid from public funds.

Such is public school education in the United States, so far as I have been able to learn its character and to describe it in the space available for that purpose. It serves the needs of the States, but would not serve the needs of England. It includes a very considerable number of common schools of admirable character and of the highest class; but, on an average, it leaves us under the impression that the common elementary schools of the States are very far inferior to the inspected schools of England, and that their teachers are not to be compared to those of our country in respect of fitness for their office, and devotion to their work. Doubtless, their middle-class "grammar schools" are often very good schools, and their "high schools" excellent schools of modern education in all its branches. No such scandalous disclosures of ignorance on the part of scholars, and inefficiency on the part of the teaching system, as were made to the English public by Lord Clarendon's Report on our great historic foundations, with Eton and Winchester at their head, could ever have been made in the United States. Still, looking at the case as a whole, the verdict I have ventured to find is, I believe, fair. Nor must it be forgotten, that England has as much right to improve in her methods as the United States. In many respects England has furnished the States with the best models of training, and with hints for improving the national system of education. In not a

few things English schools and teachers might learn excellent lessons from the best schools of America. Animation, cheerfulness, incisive, effective teaching, are the properties of all good American teachers; brightness and effective discipline are the characteristics of most American schools of any considerable pretensions; practical sense, which takes the shortest road to the result aimed at, is an attribute of American educators as it is of the American citizen in all stations of life.*

* As this chapter is passing through the press, the Report of the first United States' Civil Service examinations comes to hand. From this it appears that the general standard of education in the States is lower than I had supposed it could be. The official statement is that, "the ignorance in regard to the geography, history, and government of the United States displayed by very many of those examined was not only very great, but often ludicrous." Just where we should have expected the Civil Service candidates to be very strong they turn out to be very weak. The arithmetic and book-keeping, also, were, according to an English standard, defective. Only reading and spelling seem to have been generally good! (See the *Times* for April 25th.)

CHAPTER IV.

POPULAR EDUCATION ON THE CONTINENT.

IN respect to the United States, it was necessary to explain matters, which, for the most part, were either simply unknown, or were imagined to be altogether different from what they are. It was necessary to write with distinctness and some fulness in regard to the popular education of a nation, of necessity brought continually into comparison with ourselves; to show the remarkable points of contrast between the case of the States and our own case in England, and to dissipate radical and altogether misleading misconceptions. As respects popular education on the Continent, a much more general view will be sufficient. A very general view indeed is all that can be attempted when the large and manifold subject of Continental education, with its different and striking varieties, must all be treated of within the limits of a single chapter, as but one fraction and item in a comprehensive sketch of principles and of facts such as I am attempting to comprise within one small volume.

Nor will it be possible, of course, to refer in this sketch to all the varieties of principle and method according to which it has been attempted to solve the

problem of popular education in the different countries of Europe. The two great events which have affected the principles and course of national education in Europe are the Reformation and the French Revolution. No countries can be brought into comparison with England in the matter of education which have not come fully under the power at least of one of these great movements. No nation enthralled by Ultramontane superstition and tyranny has ever approached to the condition of an educated people. No people which, as a whole, has only recently been emancipated from bondage to Papal Rome and the Romish hierarchy can, as yet, have risen nearly to the condition of such a people. Freedom of thought is essential to anything worthy of the name of education. From the thraldom of Rome, Spain is but now uprising; though Italy has shaken off the Papal bondage, her people cannot soon or easily emerge from the condition of ignorance and degradation confirmed by ages of Romish oppression and corruption; Austria, which only within a few years past, has disengaged itself in this very matter of education from the Jesuit yoke of the Concordat, is, except in her German Protestant provinces, but a few degrees more advanced in general enlightenment than the provinces of Northern Italy. As to Southern Italy, its condition is worse than even that of Spain. I shall, therefore, not refer to any of these countries in what I am about to write.

For different reasons, I shall omit any reference to Sweden, Norway, or Denmark. The last country, indeed, may be regarded as scarcely separable, as respects education, from Germany. Norway and Sweden are very well-educated countries, and

strongly illustrate the principles which I have already stated respecting the essential connection between the general diffusion of a love of education and the general diffusion of property among the people of any country. But the population of these countries is so sparse; the people are comparatively so poor and their habits are so simple; the absence of any important element of theological or ecclesiastical Dissent in the population is so specific a feature in the case of these countries, and so vastly simplifies the problem of public education; indeed, the conditions of the educational problem are altogether so few and simple, in comparison with those of England, that I do not think it advisable, where I can only make a selection and where space is so limited, to dwell upon them. The case of Russia also I omit, as furnishing no valuable analogy or contrast to that of England.

The only countries of Europe with which it will be important to compare England in regard to public education are, as it seems to me, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland. In France, Ultramontanism has always been so far held in check, and the spirit of intellectual freedom has so far prevailed, as to bring it into the community of educated thought, and to enable it, as the central country of western Europe, to take a leading part in the interpretation of ideas from one national dialect of conception and expression to another. The relentless persecution of Protestantism never altogether suppressed the Reformation spirit of religious truth and independence, as the history of Port-Royal testifies, while it did much towards producing as a retributive consequence and compensation the outbreak of the Revolu-

tion ; and at this day, amid all confusions and follies and faults, not a little Protestant enlightenment is diffused through the highest regions of French thought and criticism. Protestant Germany, since the days of Luther, has been a very forcing-house of abstract ideas and theories on all subjects of European speculation. Switzerland is the home of earnest and practical middle-class republicanism, and is distinguished for its pre-eminent love of education. Holland, also, essentially republican, is, perhaps, the best-educated country in the world. Intellectually these are the foremost countries in Europe ; and in all of them the population is numerous, the civilisation is ancient, and the religious beliefs of the people are various and more or less dissentient. In all of them, moreover, the legislature has since the beginning of the present century effected a solution, more or less complete, but in each case specific and peculiar, of the difficult problem of national education. By a view, though it be but slight and cursory, of the different systems of popular education which have been established in these countries, we shall be better prepared to come to the discussion of the subject as respects our own people. In particular, we shall be saved from some misconceptions as to popular education in those countries which have contributed to mislead certain English theorists and those who have accepted the *dicta* of these theorists.

I omit Belgium from the comparison, partly because it is situated between Holland and France, and has had its educational methods and provisions, so far as they are operative and efficient, determined largely by the example and influence of these two countries, especially of France, whose language and literature

are shared by Belgium; and partly because, unlike Holland and far more than France, it is pervaded by Roman Catholic bigotry and superstition.

The influence of the Romish priesthood has been most unfavourable to its educational development, counteracting by its dead weight thrown into the scale of intellectual bondage and inertness the advantages which ought otherwise to have raised Belgium in the scale of enlightenment and education, full as the country is of a manufacturing population which has been devoted for centuries to many profitable and superior handicrafts, and of an agricultural peasant proprietary, unsurpassed for thrifty and plodding industry.

Let me preface what I have to say as to the countries I have selected for observation by some general remarks, relating to their several systems of education regarded conjointly or in comparison with each other, and relating, in particular, to certain special points of marked interest at the present time.

It is not uncommon, then, for persons to write or speak as if popular education on the Continent were generally secular, at least in Protestant countries. As a matter of fact, there is only one country, I believe, in all Europe—I speak not now merely of the four countries which are to pass under review—in which education is secular, and that country is Holland, where a law of secular education was adopted about fifteen years ago. At the time this law was adopted the middle and lower classes of Holland had long been better educated than those of any other country in Europe; all classes in the country also were, as they still are, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of religious observance. The children of all classes are

under the regular catechetical instruction of their clergy, and are by them universally prepared for confirmation. Among such a people the experiment of public secular education is made under exceptionally favourable circumstances. The whole Dutch people are Church-going like our serious middle-class people, or (this is the better comparison) like the Scottish people in staid Scotch country towns, and the clergy are the pastoral instructors of all.

Except for special classes of the population, there is only one country in Europe where education is gratuitous, and that is Switzerland. I shall presently show that in some features the case of Switzerland resembles that of the United States, and at the same time is in contrast to other European countries; features which make free schools exceptionally suitable to the case of Switzerland; possibly free education may not permanently meet the case of the United States, and yet may satisfy, for an indefinite period, the needs of Switzerland.

In Germany and Switzerland education is compulsory, but not, I believe, elsewhere in Europe, except in Denmark. In Holland compulsion can hardly be said to be at all necessary. The reason, however, as I am informed by Baron Donald Mackay, the Dutch Minister of Education, with whom I had lately the privilege of a conversation on the subject, why public education in Holland is not compulsory, is that it is secular. If it were to be made compulsory it is felt that it would be necessary to permit denominational schools to be recognised as State public schools. In both Germany and Switzerland the compulsory laws are operative, because they are sustained by public opinion and in harmony with the social

condition of the people. In both countries society is based on the institution of a peasant proprietary. But in Switzerland the circumstances of the people compel an indefinite number of exceptions and indulgences to be allowed in regard to the compulsory law, of which, however, the population seem never to have any disposition to take undue advantage. In Germany some difficulty is found in enforcing compulsion in the large towns and in manufacturing districts. Often the children, partly attending school and partly going to work, on a principle of half-time, have very few hours indeed left for sleep and refreshment, far fewer than English law and opinion would tolerate. In Holland and Switzerland the schools are organized on the principle of pupil-teacher service and aid. In Germany the want of any such system is a serious defect. In France the country schools are generally organized on the old British monitorial system, as are many of the town schools also ; but not a few of the schools, especially the town schools, and perhaps generally the "religious," or, as they are called, "congréganiste" schools, are organized on a system really resembling that of the original Glasgow simultaneous system, which, indeed, appears to be the same in principle with the German system of to-day.

In Holland the elementary and commercial education is admirable ; in Switzerland all the education is excellent, but there is a deficiency of compass and reach in the higher education as compared with Germany. In Germany the attendance at the school is much more unfailing and continuously prolonged than anywhere else ; the teachers are excellently instructed and trained ; and all secondary and university teaching is, on the whole, probably of unequalled

excellence. France excels in method and manner of teaching ; secondary education in France is good and excellently organized ; of university instruction there is properly none, although there are many colleges suitable rather for youths than men ; the primary education of France is, on the whole, well organized, although it is inferior comparatively to its secondary education. But there is much and dense ignorance in France.

Once again, except in France, education in the countries of which I have to speak was a direct product of the Reformation. This was the case, indeed, not only throughout Germany (at least Protestant Germany) and Switzerland, and in Holland, but in all the Lutheran and all the Calvinistic countries, *i.e.* in all the Reformed countries of the Continent, as also, under the influence of Knox, in North Britain.

Education was a part of the Church system ; and the teacher of the parochial or municipal school was regarded as a person of semi-ecclesiastical character, an officer of the Church, in many respects next to the minister. Attendance at school also, and the duty of the parents to send their children, were enforced by Church authority. Thus, from the ancient authority and discipline which were established in these countries by the Reformation arose that rooted respect for education, that universal determination to secure for their children its indispensable benefits, which has been characteristic of the people of these countries for centuries past, and which on the Continent has prepared the way for the complete modern systems of which England has lately heard so much. Even the Roman Catholic countries of Germany received their original educational impulse through the Reformation. The Jesuit schools, often excellent in their kind,

which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries represented the German Roman Catholic organization of education, were themselves a consequence of the Reformation.

In France national education owes much less, at least directly, to the influences in favour of education and intellectual progress which were set free, more or less, throughout Europe, at the period of the Reformation, than in the other countries to which I have referred ; although indirectly, France also doubtless owes not a little, in these respects, to the same great movement. France, indeed, never, even in the Middle Ages, sank to the lowest intellectual bondage to the yoke of Rome. When Germany was in thick darkness, —when in England superstition was prevented from grovelling into abject subserviency, not so much by any force of intellectual culture as by the rude independence of the barons and people,—there was in France some tincture of learning among the clergy, much abstruse speculation in the University, some sense of the grace and value of lettered culture among the nobles. There is no European university which had at once so long and so illustrious a history as that of pre-revolutionary Paris. The era of the Reformation, however, greatly quickened the intellectual life of France. Unhappily, indeed, the Valois and the Bourbon cruelly oppressed, and finally all but extirpated, the Protestantism of France, and by so doing took the heart of faith and virtue out of the land, entailing upon it the horrors of the French Revolution. But yet France never lost the intellectual stimulus it had received, and never utterly surrendered its mind to the bondage of Rome. Pascal was the most illustrious of French writers, and one of the

purest and noblest of Roman Catholic saints; but, though he was a Gallican Catholic, he was by no means a Papist. Jansenism was a fruit of the Reformation, and Pascal was the greatest of the Jansenist school. The nation which gloried in a Pascal, whose very language in its modern form has been fixed by that most pure and most chastely brilliant of its writers,—the nation which can never cease to read those "Provincial Letters," in which Pascal has embalmed in his imperishable satire the corrupt casuistry of the Jesuits,—that nation could never become merely Papist, could never be reduced so low as to exchange its "Gallican liberties" for Ultramontanism. The modern education of France, apart from the distinctly Roman Catholic tincture which so largely pervades it, and which has asserted its penetrating power and quality in France under all disadvantages, and in connection with every form of school organization, is partly derived from the long classic culture which preceded the great Revolution, and partly from the educational framework which has been established since that terribly memorable epoch. That revolution, upheaving and overthrowing all the institutions of the land, made at once the opportunity and the necessity for the construction of a national system of education. The foundations of the existing system were laid by the First Napoleon; the superstructure is due chiefly to the labours of no less illustrious an architect than Victor Cousin.

Before the Revolution primary education in France was provided for in part by certain religious orders, such as that of the *Frères Chrétiens*, and in part by the old-fashioned village pedagogue, under the direction of the *curé*. In large towns there were often,

no doubt, lay primary teachers, of real professional merit, always, however, under ecclesiastical authority and influence. The Revolution, complete in its work of destruction and abolition, found reconstruction beyond its power. It left France almost without schools, certainly without any school organization, although its paper schemes and decrees respecting national education were very comprehensive and ambitious. The Revolution did, however, establish the *Ecole Normale* and the *Polytechnique.** The First Empire reorganized secondary education, under the general direction of the University of France, which Napoleon created, but to provide a system of primary instruction was much more difficult; and the Emperor, involved in perpetual war, though he recognised the need, made no serious attempt to supply it. The total amount paid towards primary education during the First Empire was, Mr. Arnold tells us, £170. The religious orders, however, resumed their voluntary labours as primary school-teachers, and the village schoolmaster was again, in many parishes, installed in the village school under the direction of the *curé.* After the restoration of the Bourbons, ecclesiastical organization and influence in the matter of national education increased rapidly, and, indeed, had almost the whole field to themselves. But the standard of popular education was, of course, kept duly low; while education for all classes was not free but

* "What," said Mr. Matthew Arnold to M. Guizot, "did the French Revolution contribute to the cause of popular education?" "Un déluge de mots," replied the French statesman, "rien de plus." As Mr. Arnold, however, remarks, the Revolution "established certain conditions under which any future system of popular education must inevitably constitute itself. It made it impossible for any government of France to found a system which was not *lay*, and which was not *national*."—ARNOLD'S *Popular Education in France*, pp. 29-30.

fettered. A considerable number of Normal Schools, however, were established, and much more was done for primary education than under the Empire. It was after the Revolution of July, 1830, and under Louis Philippe, that Victor Cousin was employed to inquire into and report upon national education on the Continent, and that Guizot did France the great service of reorganizing its public education according to the suggestions of the philosopher.

M. Cousin's Report upon the chief Continental systems of national education, especially those of Germany and Holland, still remains a valuable authority on the subject. The system which Guizot organized for France happily united in the charge and responsibility for national education, the commune, the department, and the State ;—as if in this country the parish, the county, and the imperial Government, were respectively and conjointly made chargeable and responsible for the education of the people. Our counties, however, are not organized like a French department. The French statesman's plan proceeded, also, upon the same general principles as the original Irish mixed and unsectarian system, as organized in 1832, that plan being the one which found favour generally, at first sight, with the enlightened educationists of Europe. In Germany, indeed, the plan, after trial, had already in 1832 been set aside. But in Holland, France, and Ireland, at this period, the same sort of organization was theoretically preferred, and was practically attempted, with the remarkable result that, in all these countries alike, it has been found impossible to work it clearly and consistently through. In Holland it has been abandoned for secularism, after having first

worked into virtual denominationalism. In France, as had nearly thirty years earlier been the case in Germany, it has been exchanged for a liberally administered denominationalism, with mixed schools exceptionally interspersed to meet special cases. In Ireland it has worked into a system for the most part expressly and completely, and throughout (except the small handful of model schools) virtually, denominational. In Switzerland it has not been tried.

The reasons in favour of the mixed system are well stated in the words of Guizot, as reported by Mr. Arnold, who also well states some of the difficulties in the way of working the system :—"The text of the law of 1833," says Mr. Arnold, "and the tolerant disposition of M. Guizot himself, tended to make denominational schools, as we should call them, the exception, and common schools the rule. 'In certain cases,' says the law, 'the Minister of Public Instruction may authorise as communal schools, schools more particularly appropriated to one of the religious denominations recognised by the State.' 'It is in general desirable,' writes M. Guizot, 'that children, whose families do not profess the same creed, should early contract, by frequenting the same schools, those habits of reciprocal friendship and natural tolerance, which may ripen later, when they live together as grown-up citizens, into justice and harmony.' But the dangers to which religious liberty was sometimes exposed in these common schools did not escape him. He wished the religious instruction to be, above all things, real ; not 'a series of lessons and practices apparently capable of being used by all denominations in common. Such vague abstractions,' he said, 'satisfied the requirements neither of parents

nor of the law; they tended to banish all positive and efficacious religious teaching from the schools.' But the more the religion of the majority is taught positively and really in a school, the more it becomes necessary to guard the liberty of the minority. There is danger either that the minority will be made to participate in the religious instruction of the majority, or else that its own religious instruction will be left uncared for. Against both dangers M. Guizot endeavoured to provide. Rectors were charged to see that in public schools no child of a different religious profession from that of the majority was constrained to take part in the religious teaching and observances of his fellow-scholars. They were to permit and to request the parents of such children to cause them to receive suitable religious instruction from a minister of their own communion, or from a layman regularly appointed for the purpose. They were to take care that in every week, at fixed hours, to be agreed upon between the minister of religion, the parents, and the local committee, such children were conducted from the school to the Protestant temple, or any other edifice frequented by members of their communion, there to take part in the lessons and practices of the faith in which they had been brought up. Inspectors and local committees were strictly enjoined to see these regulations observed. Similar provision was made for religious instruction and religious freedom in the normal schools. Finally where the minority had cause to desire a school to itself, and reasonable numbers to fill it, the authorities were to be very heedful that its demand was not unjustly refused by the municipal councils."*

* Arnold's "Popular Education in France," pp. 69-71.

The system thus described was, as I have said, virtually identical with the Irish National System. The provision in the case of a minority, however, of which the numbers were adequate for the establishment of a separate school, showed how difficult it is to establish mutual association by law of different sects in the same school, and left room for an indefinite amount of indulgent and accommodating administration, such as could hardly fail largely to transform the unsectarian into a quasi-denominational system. It was like the provision by which expressly denominational schools, denominational alike in property and management, came to be admitted as part and parcel of the Irish National System, within a few years after the initiation of that system. The elaborate and most careful provisions, also, for respecting the rights of the parental conscience in the management of the schools, showed the intrinsic difficulties which were felt to stand in the way of effecting the desired union and amalgamation in the organization of school-instruction. As a matter of fact, the system was found not to work well, often not to work at all, and was abandoned in 1850, after the Revolution of 1848. Since that period, the law of primary instruction, in its main principles, appears to have remained unaltered.

"The event," says Mr. Arnold, "proved that religious instruction in common schools presents grave practical difficulties. The new law profited by the lessons of experience. Under the dominion of the new law denominational schools are the rule, common schools are the exception. In those communes where more than one of the forms of worship recog-

nised by the State is publicly professed, each form is to have its separate school. But the Departmental Council has power to authorise the union, in a common school, of children belonging to different communions. Of children thus united, however, the religious liberty is sedulously guarded. It is provided that ministers of each communion shall have free and equal access to the school, at separate times, in order to watch over the religious instruction of members of their own flock. Where the school is appropriated to one denomination, no child of another denomination is admitted except at the express demand of his parents or guardians, signified in writing to the teacher. Of such demands the teacher is bound to keep a register, to be produced to all the school authorities. I confidently affirm, in contradiction to much ignorant assertion, that the liberty thus proclaimed by the law is maintained in practice. The venerable chiefs of the principal Protestant communities of the French provinces—the president of the Consistory of Nismes, and the president of the Consistory of Strasbourg—individually assured me, that as regarded the treatment of their schools by the authorities, they had nothing whatever to complain of; that Protestant schools came into collision with the authorities no otherwise than Catholic schools came; that such collision, when it happened, was in nine cases of ten, on matters wholly unconnected with religion. In Languedoc, indeed, the embers of religious animosities still smoulder; but it is among the lower orders of the population. It is not that the State persecutes the Protestants; it is that the Protestant and Catholic mobs have still sometimes the impulse to persecute each other, and that

the State has hard work to keep the peace between them."*

I shall not attempt to describe the details of French legislation for primary education. I cannot, however, refrain from observing that one important principle introduced by Guizot in 1833 has remained unmoved during the forty years which have followed, and seems now to have taken a firm and lasting root among French institutions. I refer to the principle, already mentioned, of the joint action of the commune, the department, and the State. "If the commune possessed sufficient resources of its own to maintain its elementary school, well and good. Some had foundations, gifts, and legacies, for the maintenance of schools; some had large communal property. Where the existing resources of the commune were insufficient, it was to tax itself to an amount not exceeding three centimes in addition to its ordinary direct taxation. If this was still insufficient, the Minister of Public Instruction was to supply the deficiency out of funds annually voted by the Chambers."†

The management of the communal school, under M. Guizot's law, was entrusted to the *Maire* and *Curé* of the commune, with one or more principal inhabitants nominated by the committee of an educational circle or district, which appears to have been coincident with each sub-prefecture respectively. The Communal Committee, however, was found unsatisfactory in working; too meddling, perhaps, probably not sufficiently well-informed and enlightened, too independent in all likelihood. The District Committee

* "Popular Education in France," pp. 71, 72.
† Ibid., pp. 52, 53.

was too far aloof from the local scene to be effective. In 1850 both these committees were abolished. The communal management, which extends to morality and religion, was vested in the *Maire* and in the Minister of Religion of the congregation to which the school belonged. The schools were at the same time brought under the general inspection and direction of the Departmental Council, acting through functionaries called cantonal delegates, who have supervision of the school instruction. The supreme executive power over all the schools of the department is vested in the *Préfet*, who, and who alone, can nominate, suspend, or dismiss a teacher. Thus all the schools and the teachers are brought into stringent connection with the great Central Executive, which through the *Préfets* controls and manages all France.

The schools are not required to be free, but in a considerable number of cases they are free. If any commune pleases to maintain gratuitous schools purely out of its own resources, it is at liberty to do so. In Paris, accordingly, as was to be expected in a city whose population have been trained to dependence on the Government, and where the proletariat, like the refuse of Rome in the days of the empire, have been accustomed to expect both maintenance and amusement (*panem et circenses*) to be ensured to them by the State, primary schools have been provided gratuitously by the communes. This example has naturally been followed by the large towns of France generally. But the case is otherwise in the smaller towns and in the rural communes. "The law of 1833 had proclaimed the right of all indigent children to free instruction. But many who were not indigent had usurped this boon designed only for the

poor." (I commend the passage I am now citing to the attention of School Board members.) "The law of 1850, to prevent this abuse, directed the *Maire* and Ministers of Religion to draw up yearly, for each commune, a list of children having a real claim to the privilege; but it was soon found that the *Maire* and the Ministers were far too easy. In fact, the moment a commune had levied its three centimes, all motive for economy on the part of the communal authorities ceased; all further school expenses must be at the charge of the department or the State. At the expense of the department and the State, therefore, the parish authorities freely enlarged their list of claimants for free schooling. As a last resource (in 1853) the never-failing prefect has been charged to determine annually, for every public school of his department, the highest number of free scholars to be admitted into that school; the free admissions granted by the *Maire* and his colleagues must in no case exceed this number." * The same law also enacted that no free scholar shall be admitted into any communal school—even a free communal school—without an individual and personal ticket.

Besides the primary school for each commune, there was the Communal College, a part of the organization of secondary instruction established by Napoleon I., and which, through the *Lycées* of the principal towns in the various departments, established a chain of connection between the communes, the departments, and the Imperial University. But it was the purpose of Guizot, and was provided by his educational law of 1833, that, intermediate in character between the primary school and the Communal

* "Popular Education in France," pp. 72-73.

College, and resembling somewhat the "grammar school" of the United States, and the burgher school of Germany, there should be established in every town of 8,000 or 10,000 inhabitants a superior primary school. He provided, also, "that in these middle schools a certain number of free admissions should be reserved for the best scholars of the elementary school, to be presented, after a competitive examination, by the communal Committee." Practically, however, this excellent design was not a success.* The French are either content with poverty and simplicity, or they are ambitious. If they go at all beyond the communal school, they desire to proceed to the Communal College, if not also to the *Lycée*. Very few desire merely to be well instructed in the French language and in commercial or elementary scientific knowledge. The superior primary school accordingly has dropped out of existence, except for girls.

As in Ireland, so in France, not only lay-teachers but "brethren" and "sisters" of the teaching religious orders of the Romish Communion are recognised as legalised teachers of primary schools for the poor. As in Ireland, again, so in France the teaching "sisters" of the Roman Catholic Communion are allowed to exercise their vocation without being required to pass the State examination and obtain a State certificate. Mixed schools alone, according to the precedent of Holland and Germany, were organized as primary schools under Guizot's law of 1833; but they appear to be in growing disfavour in France. Primary girls' schools are not even now, I believe, generally organized by the State authorities, whether of department or commune, but they are often pro-

* "Popular Education in Erance," p. 73.

vided by the teaching sisterhoods, and then they are recognised as Communal Schools. I have already stated that lay-schools in France are usually organized on the old "British" plan; they are not only generally mixed, but also monitorial. I have also said that the "congréganiste" schools, or schools under the religious fraternities or sisterhoods, are organized on the simultaneous system. Both Lay and Congréganiste schools are, I believe, under the same regulations as to communal and departmental authority and Government inspection. Mr. Arnold strongly urges the need for France of the pupil-teacher system, as in Holland and England. "The brethren," he says, "were partisans of the simultaneous system which centred the whole system in the head-teacher, that is, one of themselves. The French Liberals were partisans of the mutual system which, as they hoped, would substitute innumerable neutral influences for the one influence of the ecclesiastical head-teachers." But this, he says, is past, and all alike confess the imperfections of both systems. "What," he says, "were even four teachers among these 400 boys of the Rue de Rocher with 110 boys in one room with one brother, 80 with a second, the remainder in two other rooms with the third and fourth? Popular education in France will gain more by the introduction of pupil teachers into a single school than by libraries of discussion on the mutual and simultaneous systems." *

There is at least one Normal School or College in each department of France. It is not required that all teachers should be trained, but it is that all, whether teachers of public or private schools, should

* "Popular Education in France," pp. 110, 111.

(except the teaching "sisters") have passed an examination and should be certificated. French teachers excel in clearness; their method of teaching is admirable; their explanations are singularly lucid and interesting; and they have an especial superiority as teachers of arithmetic and mathematics. But their schools, for want of pupil-teachers, are defectively organized. Moreover, though the teaching is so good in itself, its range is exceedingly narrow, especially in the case of girls. In primary schools little geography is taught, sometimes none; history is taught still less; in the way of "object lessons," and in teaching the simple rudiments of natural science through such lessons, nothing at all would seem to be done. Even in the Communal Colleges, indeed, and the *Lycées*, the French language and literature, classics, and mathematics, would appear almost to sum up the general curriculum of instruction. Of commercial and general education, of political and physical geography, of natural philosophy and science, and of other modern languages besides French, there would seem to be slight traces even in the superior schools of France, of which, up to the present time, the subjects of instruction have been determined by the University of France, which again has been entirely under political, that is, politico-ecclesiastical direction.

It is not possible to ascertain what the actual results of popular education have been in France. There are no available, or at least no adequate, statistics. The number of children attending the communal schools is stated at 2,700,000; but these are not all the schools of France. The number of children on the registers of English and Scotch public elementary schools is upwards of 2,000,000, without taking into

account the multitude of uninspected primary schools, and of private schools of every sort. Our own country will presently have a larger supply of schools, and a larger attendance of scholars, at least in comparison, than France, if indeed it has not already. But this is no criterion whatever as to educational results. The question is, how many of those who leave school have received a sound and permanent education; whether the tincture is but slight, or whether the educational dye has been so given and taken as that the colours are "fast" and will not "wash out." There is no such Government examination of the scholars in France as in this country, no official ascertainment of results in each individual case. We know one fact only to indicate with any precision the actual educational condition of France. Thirty per cent. of recent French conscripts are unable to read, the conscripts being men of almost all classes, except those whose families can afford to pay the price necessary to procure substitutes. Twenty per cent. of the men of England and Wales who married in 1870 were unable to write; the proportion of those unable to read being no doubt smaller. The comparison would seem to be in favour of England. It is certain that the popular education of France is far inferior in its aim and school organization to that of England. The children who go steadily through the English schools receive a vastly more liberal and instructive education than the scholars in the French primary schools. It is certain that the French peasantry and working people who are able to read and write are yet, for the most part, utterly ignorant of politics, history, and everything else, except what belongs to their commune, their business routine and, perhaps,

(in some sort) their religion. The all-absorbing and all-controlling despotism of France, leaving no political, and hardly any civil or parochial, life anywhere, destroys all popular interest in public affairs, whether on a larger or smaller scale. Such a people cannot be expected to read books or journals of any educational value, even if they had money to buy them, which, very often indeed, they have not. There can be no doubt, accordingly, that the provincial population of France, and especially the peasantry, is densely ignorant. The late war, indeed, has demonstrated the amazing ignorance, even of French military officers, and in general of French officials almost universally, in regard to all matters of political and geographical knowledge, in regard to almost everything, indeed, unconnected with the modern literature, or the fashions, or the very recent history, of their own country. On an average, there can be no doubt that the French people are far less informed than the English.

Still there may be in England a larger proportion of persons totally untinctured with education than in France. Mr. Arnold leaves the impression that in his judgment this is probably the case. "I could not discover," he says, "that even in the great towns, where population is thickest, masses of poor children remained anywhere without instruction." "I believe that in the great cities of France industry is organized down to a much lower stage than in those of England; that the number of families without any regular and recognised mode of living is far smaller; that the number of children, therefore, left by parents, who themselves hang loose upon society, to run as wild through the streets as themselves, is comparatively restricted." *

* Arnold, "Popular Education in France," p. 102.

This is what I should have expected to find, according to the principles laid down in the first two chapters of this volume. Society in France is organized upon the basis of a peasant proprietary. The people are often very poor, but are, until demoralized by special and peculiarly intense influences, as in Paris, very industrious and saving; and even in Paris are seldom coarsely and recklessly wasteful. This is a fundamental and pervasive feature of the national character. The poverty of France, in comparison of England, arises from the devastation of wars and revolutions, from the want of a continuous enlightened peace policy, and, consequently, of the proper development of the national resources, and, in part, also, very probably, from the artificial, enforced, and excessive *amorcellement* of the land of the country. Better legislation, a more enlightened commercial policy, continued peace, would greatly improve the condition of the people; true and thorough liberty, civil as well as political—liberty as distinguished from equality—would operate to improve the general education of the French nation, by giving them an interest in politics and all public affairs. But they are at any rate so far of educated character, in virtue of their position as proprietors, that they care for education, and are anxious that their children should get as much plain schooling as they fairly can. The labour-market is a most potent temptation to turn the child's labour to profit, and it is so turned accordingly; but yet some schooling is generally secured for the children. The boy and the girl are wanted on the farm or at home by their peasant parents: nevertheless some shift is made to get the children to the

communal school. The people at large have almost universally, alike in town and country, the appearance and manners of a civilised and careful, a responsible and often even a refined, population. This result is due, in part, to some tincture, gained by nearly all, of clear and kindly teaching, not destitute of proper moral influence, but probably yet more to the social conditions of self-respecting poverty, very frugal and pinched, but still independent, under which the population grow up. There is much of the tiger spirit in a Parisian mob, but not much of coarse brutality, or of reckless animalism, among the peasantry or the labouring classes of France generally.

From France I turn to Germany. Here the details are much more complex than in France, and in the different countries there are many diversities of law and administration. At the same time the general principles, common to all, or nearly all, the systems of the different States, are the same, and are all on which there is any need to bestow explicit attention. The general educational condition and results as to Germany, also, are certain and undisputed. I shall therefore be able, and shall, indeed, find it necessary, with the space at my disposal, to deal with the subject of popular education in Germany more in mass and less in detail than in the case of France.

Not only Protestant but Roman Catholic Germany may be said to be well educated ; not only Saxony or Lutheran Prussia, but Bavaria and German Austria ; it is said, indeed, that some of the Roman Catholic districts of Central and Southern Germany are better educated than some of the high aristo-

cratic and Lutheran countries of the North. Still it appears to be a simple historical truth that the grand source of educational enlightenment and zeal in Germany was the spirit of the Reformation. The Jesuits became great and successful school-teachers and organizers of education in South Germany; but Protestant teachers and Protestant school organization were in the field before them, full of the new enlightenment and life which the Reformation brought to Germany first among European countries, and the impulse of which Germany has never since lost. Jesuit education was a reaction from Protestant education. Attendance at school, in North Germany as in Scotland, was an ecclesiastical ordinance of compulsory force at least as early as the middle of the seventeenth century. Long before the modern German educational movement began, public opinion and ecclesiastical government, both in the territories of Lutheranism and of the Calvinistic Reformed Churches, had given the authority both of ancient custom and of religious obligation to the parental duty of educating children.

The modern movement may be said to date from the period of Napoleon's victories over Germany. Humbled Prussia felt that her disgrace could only be wiped away and her position retrieved by means of an enfranchised and invigorated people, a people raised into intelligent manliness by means of personal freedom and thorough education. Hence the series of measures which, during the last sixty or seventy years, have transformed Prussia into the great power she now is. Other German countries have learnt from Prussia, and have followed her example.

First serfdom was abolished. Baron Von Stein and Prince Von Hordenberg are the statesmen whose

names are inseparably associated with this great achievement. A succession of edicts, beginning in 1807 and ending in 1821, finally completed the work. Other German countries followed the example. In most the essential laws were passed between 1807 and 1814. But, as we have seen, serfdom was not abolished in Lusatia till 1832, nor in Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen till 1833.

It was thus at the very lowest ebb of Prussia's fortunes, in her hour of deepest sorrow and disgrace, that the first steps were taken towards her elevation and aggrandisement. About the time when the Prussian ladies, stung with the sorrows of their Queen, and sore with the wrongs of their country, were devoting their gems and gold to their country's cause, and taking from their King stern iron ornaments in exchange, whose chain and fetter pattern should remind them of Prussia's bondage till the day of her deliverance should come, the foundation was being laid of that work of national enfranchisement and elevation which was to issue in the victory of united Germany over prostrate and humbled France.

In 1819, after the war was over, came the next great step in the work of national elevation; this was the *Project of a General Law on the Organization of Public Instruction in Prussia*, which contains the groundwork of the whole organization that has since grown into fully developed existence. Thus was the reign of Frederick William III., notwithstanding many disgraces, redeemed by the two great and closely related legislative achievements by which serfdom was done away, and the basis laid of the most complete system of national education that the world has yet seen.

As originally projected the educational system of Prussia was designed, as far as practicable, to proceed upon the principle of united education, and as little as possible upon the principle of separate denominational schools. This was in itself to the mind of Prussian statesmen, as to that of Guizot, and of the English Whig Government of 1832, which laid the foundations of the Irish National System, naturally the most attractive idea on which to work. The Prussian monarch, indeed, had, in 1817, laid the basis of the Evangelical United Church, into which he hoped to absorb and unite the two hitherto separate communions of the Lutheran and the Calvinistic Reformed Churches. In the same spirit the King desired to do away, as far as possible, with separate schools for the different communions. He could see no reason whatever why there should be two sorts of Protestant schools in his dominion. Nor did he realise the impossibility of fusing even the Roman Catholic school-education of the country, along with the Protestant, into one comprehensive unsectarian system, in which provision should be made for fully respecting the rights of conscience on the part of the different religionists, and for having all the children carefully and strictly instructed in theological and ecclesiastical subjects by the pastors of their respective communions.

This project, however, failed in Prussia, as it failed afterwards in France and in Ireland. The words I have before quoted from Mr. Arnold as regards France are virtually applicable to the case of Prussia. The King's proposed fusion of the Protestant churches in one Evangelical Union has largely failed; the communions never really united, and have now, to a con-

siderable extent, fallen back again into confessed separation. So it has been found that in education common schools and united education must be the exception and not the rule. For fifty years past—almost ever since the system was fully developed—the maxim on which the public administrator in Prussia has proceeded has been to establish separate schools wherever there were children enough of any denomination to warrant it. Where this is not the case, very particular rules and injunctions are laid down to secure, if possible, perfect protecion for minorities. This had been long the established order of things when Mr. Joseph Kay was in Germany thirty years ago.* Mr. Pattison's Report to the Education Commission shows us that the experience of a quarter of a century since Mr. Kay's visit had only confirmed the rule in favour of denominational schools. The information furnished by Mr. Pattison on this point is so instructive, and bears so strongly on questions current to-day in this country that I must quote from his Report at some length :—

"As early as 1822," he says, "we find that mixed schools were expressly recognised by Government to have failed, and were only to be continued exceptionally in such localities as could not maintain a confessional school. This rescript is the more remarkable, as coming from Von Altenstein, a minister whose views on popular education are above suspicion of sectarian bias :—

"'Experience has shown that, in simultaneous schools, the chief matter of education, viz. religion, is not sufficiently cared for, and it lies in the nature

* Kay's "Social Condition and Education of the People," vol. ii. p. 27.

of the case that it cannot be. The intention of these schools, to wit, the promotion of tolerant feelings between the members of different communions, is seldom or never attained. Disagreements between teachers of the two confessions in the same school, or between the master and the parents of the opposite confession, have often involved the whole commune in religious dissension ; to say nothing of the other evils inseparable from mixed schools. Such establishments can, therefore, no longer be regarded as the rule. Exceptions may still be allowed, either in cases of obvious necessity, or when such a coalition is the free choice of the two congregations, acting under the advice of their respective clergy, and with the approval of the temporal and spiritual authorities.'*

"This was nearly the state of the law and the practice down to the year 1848. It has been already mentioned, that the dependence of the elementary school on the Church was one among the fundamental axioms of German administration much agitated at that time. Connected with it was the further question of the character of the religious instruction to be given in the school. In the National Assembly at Berlin only a small party was found to support a system of general religious instruction in Scripture history and the doctrines common to all Christian sects. This view, though supported in the press by Director Diesterweg, met with little public favour.

"The method of secular schools with separate religious instruction, whether to be given in the school, or, as in Holland, out of it, by the respective ministers of religion, was the plan at first most generally supported both in and out of the National

* "Cabinet Rescript" of 27th April, 1822.

Assembly. Though the dissolution of the Assembly, 5th December, 1848, broke off the discussion of the subject prematurely, it had yet been carried far enough to bring about a general conviction that the practical difficulties in the way of organizing the Prussian schools on this system were all but insuperable.

"It was called to mind that the original foundation of so many of the schools by the church had connected school and church in many material ways. The funds out of which the master was paid were often church revenues—partly endowments, partly collections in the churches. Many schoolmasters are at the same time officers of the church, and make up a considerable part of their income by holding such offices. The school-buildings and master's dwelling-house are often church property, or the church-chest is liable for their maintenance and repair. It was considered that the secular system, however it might be liked in the towns and by the middle-class, would be very unacceptable to the country people; that, were an attempt made to carry it out, a powerful party would be formed against it, who would erect rival schools, which, supported by the religious consciousness of the people, would empty the State schools. The result of the attempt would thus be to call into being a network of exclusively Church schools, and so to make education more sectarian than before.

"Accordingly the Constitution (*Verfassung*) of 31st January, 1851, contains the following article:—

"'Article 24.—In the ordering of the public people's school, regard shall be had, as far as possible, to denominational relations. The religious instruc-

tion in the people's school is under the conduct of the respective religious bodies.'

"This article probably represents pretty fairly the result of the previous discussion to which the subject, both in the Assembly and by the public at large, had been submitted. As far as legislation is concerned, no further alteration has taken place since 1851.

"Were the question asked—Is the Prussian system at the present moment a system of mixed or denominational education? the answer must be, that there is no general law for the whole kingdom on the subject. According to the letter of the law any commune is free to have a mixed school, if it can agree to do so, and can obtain the consent of the authorities; but so strong is now the feeling against mixed schools, that it is scarcely likely that this consent would ever be asked, or, were it asked, would be granted. By a mixed school (*Simultan-schule*) is meant one in which the teachers are taken in equal proportions from the two religions. In a village school, where there is only one master, the method was to appoint a Protestant and a Catholic alternately on the vacancy of the office, an expedient which, at one time not uncommon in Posen and East Prussia, has ceased since 1856. The strictly secular school was introduced into the western provinces with the French law, as a necessary portion of the municipal system of that law in which the commune is a purely civil division; but though the Code Napoleon is still retained, a cherished possession, by the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine, the schools have almost all become confessional schools, and this without any legislative enactment, but by the mere current of circumstances.

"The commune still remains a civil corporation, with the obligation of building and maintaining both church and school for the inhabitants within its boundaries; but the preference of confessional schools is now so decided that Protestants and Catholics have invariably separate schools. In a parish where the Protestants are in a minority, for example, they will build and endow their own school, and then oblige the commune to pay for it, and to contribute to the master's salary. They retain the right all this while to send their children into the original, or Catholic school, as it is then called; for the school, though legally common, has become, in fact, Catholic by the secession of the Protestants. A Protestant family in the neighbourhood of Mörs (Dep. Dusseldorf), having exercised the privilege of sending their children to such a school, in consequence of the great distance of the nearest Protestant school, when the time of examination came, the Catholic *Dekan* (inspector) held the examination as usual, without sending notice to the Protestant pastor, treating the school as a Catholic school. The pastor made a complaint to the departmental government, and the *Dekan* was reprimanded, these original schools being the property of the commune, and, therefore, equally open to both confessions.

"But when a congregation builds a school for itself, it may oblige the commune to take it and to pay for it, but it may stipulate that it shall remain confessional, and such a school is not open to any other confession. In poor and remote villages, a few mixed schools may still remain in the Rhine province, but they are only kept so by the poverty of the people, and are yearly disappearing before the

advance of wealth and population. Even the grammar schools are all confessional, and belong to one or other of two classes; being either of old foundation, and therefore established by the Jesuits, or recently established by the congregations for their own use. Even in the latter case, however, children of the opposite confession are not excluded from attending them; *e.g.* at Bonn, the Catholic gymnasium is very largely attended by Protestant boys, who receive their religious instruction separately from their own clergymen, all the masters being necessarily Catholic."*

Nor is the information which he gives less instructive as to the working of united education in those cases in which there has actually been a fusion into one congregation of the Lutherans and Calvinistic Reformed. It must be remembered that there are now in Prussia three forms of State-endowed Protestantism—the Lutheran, the Calvinistic Reformed, and the Evangelical United. The two former, as well as the Roman Catholics, have their separate schools; the Evangelical United, as they have but one congregation, have only one school. Nevertheless, let us note what happens in their case.

"The two great traditional Protestant sects of Lutherans and Presbyterians (*Reformirte*) are, as is well known, combined in Prussia, Baden, and some other countries into an 'Evangelical Establishment' (*Evangelische landeskirche*). In this union, while each sect preserves its distinctive doctrinal formula, public worship and government are one and the same. It follows that the Evangelical school is one and the same for both. But as the union of the sects is external only, not doctrinal, the Calvinists, of

* Report of Education Commission, vol. iv. pp. 212-214.

course, require that the points of belief by which they are distinguished from the Lutherans shall be taught in the schools to their children. Accordingly, in the districts of mixed (Lutheran and Presbyterian) population, the masters have been trained in the seminary to the use of both catechisms, the Heidelberg as well as Luther's. In the school the master either teaches them separately, or teaches Luther's catechism with reference to Heidelberg on the points of difference. In Neuwied I found the Lutheran and Calvinist congregations maintaining separate schools, but I was told that was a solitary instance in Prussia, for the *French* Calvinist schools in Berlin are scarcely a case in point. A great deal depends on the tact of the individual teacher, and much also on the temper of the people. Where the union is firmly rooted in public opinion the differential points will constitute no school difficulty; but this is not always the case. The approximation of the two sects, which had been silently proceeding, and had advanced further than at any time since the Reformation, has been lately checked by a disposition on the part of some of the Lutheran clergy to lay stress on the distinctive points. It is a cheap way to notoriety to preach 'pure Lutheranism,' and any young preacher who chooses to do this in one of the large manufacturing towns, such as Düsseldorf or Elberfeld, can easily fan into flame the smouldering embers of religious discord between Lutheran and Reformed. This is preparing an embarrassment for the Evangelical schools which may compel the adoption of another system."*

Dissent is not unknown in Protestant Germany; but, as Mr. Pattison says, the numbers of Dissenters

* Report of Education Commission, vol. iv. pp. 215, 216.

are so small as not to interfere with denominational education. The fact that the two or three congregational and ecclesiastical varieties of which I have spoken are all established and financially sustained by the State greatly simplifies, of course, the problem of national education in Germany. So in France the problem is soluble with comparative ease, because both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are maintained by the State, and also because the Protestants are but a very small minority. In England the power and prevalence of voluntary and independent Dissent or Nonconformity makes the situation more difficult. A mixed system, however, is no whit the easier where Dissenting voluntaryism abounds; rather it is the more difficult. Nor is it impossible in England to unite voluntary Church agencies with the State in the work of popular education. On the contrary, the system which Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth was the chief instrument in initiating appears now to have been brought by Mr. Forster to a position which leaves little to be desired in this respect. Some further amendment may be necessary, in order to separate the State undeniably from any suspicion of contributing payment to the denominational school for any other than national objects and secular results; but the principle of the requisite solution would seem to be established to the contentment of candid men who thoroughly understand the subject and all its difficulties. In Ireland the case is different. There the schools, being all, except some of the model schools,* either expressly—as is the case with five-sevenths of the whole—

* The number of Irish Model Schools is twenty-seven. Of these, however, several are, to all intents and purposes, Roman Catholic schools, although directly under the management of the National Board.

or at least virtually denominational, are yet almost entirely maintained by the State in its imperial capacity ; maintained not out of local rates, but out of the consolidated fund. That, undoubtedly, is a case of peculiar difficulty. But I must not further dwell on this point here ; in a later chapter the case of Ireland will be specially and separately considered. Provision is made in Prussia in the case of some small Dissenting sects for the children connected with them to receive religious instruction from the religious teachers or ministers of their respective sects.

On such principles the most difficult point to settle in any national provision of school education has been settled in Prussia, where public schools and the people's education are under the direct control of a special department and Minister of State. This is the Prussian solution of the religious difficulty, and it is adopted generally, I believe, throughout Northern Germany. In Würtemberg and some other countries of Southern Germany primary education is not directly under the charge and control of a special Minister and Department of State, but is a matter of ecclesiastical control and arrangement, under the sanction of the general law of the country, the Church being only another aspect of the State. The management of the schools is placed under the Ecclesiastical Assemblies, under the High Consistory of the Kingdom, and the subordinate Local Presbyteries, or Church Meetings. In this case it will be seen at once that the schools are even more closely connected with the congregations than in Prussia, and are directly under Church regulation, always, however, as generally defined and limited by the laws of the kingdom. In a few of the smaller States, as Hesse-

Darmstadt, the management of the schools is more purely and exclusively a matter of State concern, and is more fully under lay control throughout than in Prussia, much more in Würtemberg.

The nature of the ultimate link uniting the schools in Würtemberg to the Ministry of State is thus stated by Mr. Pattison :—"The Minister of Public Instruction in Würtemberg is at the head of the whole department of education ; but though his power over the University and the higher schools is direct, he can approach the elementary schools only through the Consistory. He is their medium of communication with the Government, and he can, on his own responsibility, at once refuse to bring forward any proposal which involves money grant."* His chief power, accordingly, is negative ; he holds the purse.

The following remarks of Mr. Pattison as to the cases of Würtemberg and Prussia respectively merit attention at the present time :—

"In the instance of Würtemberg we have an opportunity of seeing primary instruction occupying its primitive position, as in the times of the Reformation, as a subordinate function of the Church. The higher schools have indeed escaped from ecclesiastical superintendence, and the real schools, being a modern erection, have never been subject to it. But the elementary schools are attached throughout to the Church organism, and are only so far interfered with by either the central or the local secular authorities, as the Church administration itself is liable to be controlled by the same. Between this arrangement and its opposite, which obtains *e.g.* in Hesse-Darmstadt, is found that mixed system which prevails in

* Report, Schools Inquiry Commission, p. 171.

the majority of the Protestant States, and especially in Prussia and Saxony.

"The very foremost feature of the educational condition of Germany at this moment is a revival of the influence of the Church and its claims to educate the people. It is precisely in Prussia that this movement has been most active and successful; yet we do not hear in Prussia of dissatisfaction among the clergy with the central power or its encroachments on them. They dislike the Chambers, which they regard as hostile to them. They are also at war with the principle of local or self-government; at least in the towns, though not unfavourable to it in the country. But the relations of the Protestant Church with the Central Government in the matter of education are harmonious. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, is in a condition of perpetual discord with the States on this subject.

"The technical organization of primary instruction in Prussia divides the superintendence between the Church and the State in the following manner:—

"The pastor of the parish is *ex officio* local inspector of the elementary schools, both chief and affiliated, within his parish; but the term *inspector* implies much more than is meant by it in England, including superintendence as well as visitation. Besides this, the school, or school union, if the parish contain affiliated schools, is managed, not as in Würtemberg, by the Church Presbytery, but by a Board of Managers (*Schulvorstand*). The composition of this board varies in different provinces, but in all the clergyman of the parish is a member; in most he is chairman. In cases where, as in the province of Prussia, the chairmanship of the board is reserved

for the patron of the school, yet as the patron, probably a great landed proprietor, is never present, the clergyman takes his place.

"The immediate ecclesiastical superior of the parish clergyman is the *superintendent*, and he is also *ex officio* inspector of the schools in his district. When the superintendent acts in this capacity he is styled *kreisschulinspector*, or simply *schulinspector* (*schulpfleger*), the pastor having the title of *lokalschulinspector*. The superintendent, like the Drau, in Würtemberg, visits a third part of his district every year, and includes in his visitation the parish schools. The real authority of the superintendent has varied at different times, though his paper attributes have remained the same. At one time the office had fallen into such contempt that it was difficult to find a clergyman willing to take it; but of late years serious attempts have been made to restore its dignity, and to invest these visitations with importance. For the last ten years these have been made with great ceremony. A service is held in church, and a sermon preached, at which masters and children are required to attend; but the real inspection of the school takes place at the annual examination, which the superintendent, in his character of inspector, is present at, but does not conduct.

"The consistory is the authority next above the superintendent, and to which he is ecclesiastically responsible; but in school affairs this is not the case. The provincial consistory has only the superintendence of the training schools, which are under its immediate charge, and with which the superintendent has nothing to do. But the elementary

schools and schoolmasters are not, at least immediately, under the control of the consistory, but under that of a civil officer called departmental councillor (*regierungsschulrath*)."*

I must forego any attempt to explain the chain of civil administration by which the school administration of the parish (*gemeinde* or commune) is, in the case of Prussia, connected with the Central Government of Berlin. My object is rather to exhibit principles than to relate details. Where I give details it is for the sake of making a principle more fully distinct, or of some useful and suggestive analogy with the case of our own country. I will only remark, in passing from the subject of the relations of the school to the Church, as illustrated typically in the cases of Prussia and Würtemberg respectively, that these are probably the best-educated countries in Germany, and that perhaps the people of Würtemberg, the country of pietism and of evangelical feeling and sympathy, are, on the whole, better educated than those of Prussia.

Apart from the differences of administration to which I have referred, the arrangements for national education throughout Germany are much alike everywhere. There is the *gemeinde*, or commune, or parish, with its official school committee, and its clerical manager, or managers, the population of each parish being required by law to provide such schools as are necessary, and to bear the chief, or the whole, cost of their support. There is the circle, diocese, or district, with the lay district inspector and the clerical superintendent. There is, in the larger States, as Prussia, the department, including a

* Report of Education Commission, vol. iv. pp. 171-173.

number of circles, or districts, with its prefect and by his side two school councillors, a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. There is the Minister of the Interior, with whom is associated the Minister of Public Worship and Education.

Every village commune must have its primary school or schools; every town of any size, besides the primary schools, also the higher primary, or burgher schools. Along with these come in the real schools, a sort of school in which science, in a somewhat elementary and very practical form, is united with the subjects belonging to a general, civil, and political education; so as to form a school standing in much the same relation to science and general instruction on the one hand, as the well-organized English grammar school, or American high school, holds to classical instruction and general education on the other. These real schools are the growth in Germany of recent years, and appear to be directly dependent on some such sub-educational department of the general administration as our Science and Art Department in England. Then, above these, are the progymnasia, gymnasia, and universities, of which I do not propose to speak.

Of the thoroughness of the German teaching and training, and the excellence of the results attained in the German schools, there can be no doubt. Nevertheless, I wish to protest against the conclusion that the German system of school organization and instruction is in itself the best, or that it is superior to that system which is exemplified in the best English schools. I believe, on the contrary, that it is inferior to the best English type of school organization and school instruction. There is no pupil-

teacher system in Germany. I have quoted what Mr. Arnold has written respecting the defect of French popular education in this respect. I am not at all prepared to admit that the example of Germany proves anything in favour of France, or against Mr. Arnold's eulogy of the pupil-teacher system. Rather the success attained in Germany is in virtue of other and exceptionally great advantages enjoyed by Germany in respect of popular education, and is in spite of a system, in this respect defective, and contrasting unfavourably not only with that of England, but of Switzerland and Holland.

Men go hastily to Germany, and see a German school taught only by adult teachers, a teacher to each separate class ; they see or hear besides that a similar plan is in operation in the expensively appointed and efficient schools which are among the shows of some towns in the United States, and they come to the conclusion that modern science is opposed to the employment of pupil-teachers, and requires that only adult teachers should have any charge of children. Whereas the fact is that, *for elementary schools*, the pupil-teacher system is the only truly scientific system ; that the separate class and teacher system is the very old system, which has been superseded because of its ineffectiveness, and that where this system succeeds, it is under conditions altogether different from those which belong to the elementary schools of England.

The German system of to-day is substantially identical with the old Glasgow simultaneous system, the merits of which have nowhere been better tested than in these kingdoms, and which has on the best grounds been supplanted by our present pupil-teacher

system, without, however, discarding the duly regulated and guarded use of the simultaneous system, or those admirable principles of instruction and training which were characteristic of the Glasgow Normal College system, as organized and inspired by the late Mr. Stow. The pupil-teacher system seems to be confounded with the monitorial or mutual system, the Lancasterian system, which was the earliest form of the "British" school system; whereas our pupil-teacher system combines the merits of the simultaneous and the monitorial systems, whilst it provides against the defects of both.

It is certain, at all events, that our English system is the only one which could have worked during the last twenty years in this country, the only one adapted to the conditions of society and the labour market in this country. It may be practicable in Germany, where £30 a year in gross payment is good pay for a teacher, to have a public school manned only by grown teachers. But in this country, where the teacher is paid six times the amount, this would not be possible. Even in Germany the result is that the classes under the charge of each teacher separately are far too large for thorough and efficient teaching at all points, and through all the school-time. No teacher can, by himself, and without the aid at least of effective monitors, teach constantly a class of seventy or eighty children, although they may be nearly of the same age and standard of attainments. There are always great differences in children. The child who is quick in arithmetic is often slow at reading. The clever reader is often a dull calculator. Ability in grammar by no means implies cleverness in geography, and *vice versâ*. In particular, to teach

reading and dictation to backward scholars requires minute and individual drill. Children, to be well taught, must often be broken up into small squads, with a monitor or pupil-teacher over them. And although on certain subjects a teacher may be able to give capital and effective simultaneous lessons to a large class, yet for many purposes of eliciting thought, and correcting error, and supplying defect, he must be able to deal with each scholar apart, or as one of a much smaller section. Besides all which, for slate-work and paper-work, than which nothing can be more important, to be properly examined, it is certain that the teacher needs to have a comparatively small class. All the educational science of England fixes the maximum at from thirty to forty; sciolism, which phrases largely about Continental education and the German system, talks about teaching with ease and efficiency a class of eighty.

By the pupil-teacher system a scientific form and organization has been given to that provision of pupil aid in schools, the need of which is universally felt in public elementary education, and the rude and ready form of which, open to grave objection, and altogether imperfect and unsatisfactory, is found in the use of monitors—sometimes recognised as such, and sometimes extemporised, as necessity compels, and used without formal recognition. This use of monitors has been almost universal in popular education, except where a pupil-teacher system has been organized. The pupil-teacher system of England is identical in principle with the corresponding system of paid and trained monitors which had been in use in Holland and Switzerland long before the development of our English growth of pupil-teachers. Sir

James P. Kay-Shuttleworth was, in the first instance, led into the adoption of this principle, as others had been on the Continent, by the necessity of the case. It was in superintending the reform of educational methods in our English pauper schools that the necessity was brought home to him of organizing a system of selected and trained monitors. But he at once perceived that it needed to be applied, not only in our pauper schools, but in all our elementary schools; he saw also its important bearing on the subject of teacher-training and teacher-supply. With a view to master the Dutch and Swiss applications of the same principle, as well as the educational systems and methods in general of Holland and Switzerland, he visited those countries. The result of his researches and observations, as well as of his personal experience, appeared in the system which, as Secretary of the Educational Department, he devised and developed for England, and of which some account is given in his own writings, now in part collected in the interesting and valuable volume entitled, "Four Periods of Public Education."*

As to this matter of pupil-teachers, I have quoted, in the last chapter, the words of one of the most competent witnesses and judges in Europe, Mr. Matthew Arnold. Mr. Arnold possesses an unrivalled acquaintance with European systems of education, both primary and secondary, and has more than once been commissioned by Government to make special inquiry into the methods and results of popular education on the Continent. He has, in such a capacity, officially visited the schools, and inspected the methods, of France, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, and Holland;

* Longmans & Co.

and the results of his inquiries remain in two volumes, one on "Popular Education in France, Switzerland, and Holland," the other entitled, "Schools and Universities on the Continent." I will here repeat his judgment as to the pupil-teacher system, quoted some pages back. He declares that popular education in France will gain more by the introduction of pupil-teachers into a single school than by libraries of discussion on the mutual and simultaneous systems. He adds the following sentences, which I have not before quoted :—

"Pupil-teachers—the sinews of English primary instruction, whose institution is the grand merit of our English State system, and its chief title to public respect ; this, and I will boldly say, the honesty with which that system has been administered. Pupil-teachers—the conception for England of the founder of English popular education, of the administrator whose conceptions have been as fruitful as his services were unworthily maligned, of Sir James Shuttleworth. In naming them, I pause to implore all friends of education to use their best efforts to preserve this institution to us unimpaired."*

Mr. Arnold has not reported on the primary schools of Germany, although he has on its secondary schools and universities; but Mr. Joseph Kay, whose acquaintance with popular education in Germany and Switzerland is perhaps of longer standing than that of any other man in England, in his very valuable work on "The Social Condition and Education of the People," thus describes what he had observed as to the injurious effect upon school teaching in Germany of the want of pupil-teachers ; and it

* Arnold's "Popular Education in France," pp. 108, 109.

must be remembered that Mr. Kay is an enthusiastic admirer of German principles and methods in general, in respect to all that touches the educational and social condition of the people. "I have often," he says, "been in schools in Prussia, where the teacher had about one hundred children of different degrees of proficiency to instruct in the same class-room, without any assistance whatever; the consequence was, that while he was teaching one class the others were in disorder, and making noise enough to distract the attention of the children who were receiving instruction, as well as that of the teacher who was giving it; while the teacher, instead of being able to devote his time to the higher branches of instruction, and to the children who more particularly needed his care, was obliged to divide it among all, and to superintend himself the very lowest branches of instruction; and this, too, at the sacrifice of the order and quiet of his school." "In Switzerland," Mr. Kay goes on to say, "a very different course is pursued; the teachers are assisted by monitors, chosen from among their most advanced pupils. These monitors remain with the teacher until they are of sufficient age to go to a normal college: they are paid, I believe, by the parishes, and are instructed by the teachers in the evenings. From among them the young candidates for the vacant places in the normal colleges are chosen; so that the Swiss teachers have often been engaged in schools and in school-management from their earliest years. Besides this advantage, the country is spared a great expense; for in Prussia, where they have no monitors, they are obliged to augment the number of their teachers, and I have found in a small school, which could have been very

easily managed by one teacher and some well-trained monitors, as many as three teachers, for whom good (?) salaries had to be provided, as well as houses and gardens."*

So wrote Mr. Kay, the brother of Sir James P. Kay-Shuttleworth, in 1849, of what he had observed two years before. At that period our English pupil-teacher system was but in its first and comparatively faint beginning. It is evident that we have the general outline of it here indicated in his account of the Swiss system. As to this particular question, Mr. Kay suggests conclusive reasons why England should beware of taking Germany as an educational model, and holds up in contrast the Swiss system, identical in principle with our English pupil-teacher system, as affording an excellent pattern for us to imitate.

I have said that the German system of to-day is essentially the same as the Glasgow simultaneous system of thirty years ago. To any one acquainted with that system, the description, which I am about to quote from Mr. Pattison, of the Prussian simultaneous teaching will recall the well-known criticisms, as to the great power and the special weakness of that system, with which in this country we have been long familiar.

"Another weak point," says Mr. Pattison, "in the German method lies in what constitutes its excellence. The teaching is all class-teaching, the individual child is lost in the class as the soldier is lost in his company. The power of class-teaching to quicken and incite is so far beyond what can be got out of individual instruction, the whole result attained is so much

* Kay's "Social Condition and Education of the People," vol. ii. pp. 202-3. See also pp. 200-203.

greater, that it is apt to be thought that what the class produces must be the possession of each child who composes it. This fallacy is not attended to in the German schools, and is precisely most deceptive in the best. It is, indeed, the power of the aggregate class with which the teacher works all his effects. Even in point of discipline, it is not the terror of punishment, but the organization of the class, which tames the wild infant, coming, perhaps, from a home in which it has not acquired the least notion of law and order. Many children bring this with them, but with many it requires time before they understand what it is that is required of them in the submission of the will to the general purposes of the school. The same holds good of teaching. The contagion of example and emulation rouses the curiosity, commands the attention, and quickens the perceptions generally both of teachers and taught. I can convey no idea of the excitement of a catechetical lesson from a skilled master with a clever class in a German school; the master all animation, the children all eagerness. The questions rising one above the other by the gentlest gradation from the simple to the more complicated, evolving the subject with a methodical clearness equal to demonstration, question and answer passing so rapidly that it is as much as the spectator can do to keep up with it. The intellectual gratification to the children from the process is so great that I have seen them, when the hour was ended, entreat that the lesson might go on, instead of going out for their ten minutes' play interval. The good effect of this class-drill, in attaching the children to school and to the teacher, in whetting their appetite for learning, is apparent enough; but as a measure of the mental

cultivation each individual in the class is receiving such a display is deceptive. The problem was really worked by the teacher, followed not by each child, but by the aggregate only. The children have seemed to solve difficulties really beyond their reach. But not only is the class, not the child, that which is taught in the Prussian school, but it is the class which the school councillor inspects in examination. It is the goodness or badness of classes which he tests, which he enters in his returns. This runs through the whole Prussian system; nor did I ever meet with any schoolman who thought it a defect, however he might be alive to other faults in that system. In the schools of Anhalt (Bernburg) a system has been introduced pedantically called the 'monothelitic,' of which the principle is that the whole class moves, acts, and is regarded as a single individual with a single will."*

It is evident that a system of classes organized on the principle of simultaneous teaching needs to be traversed and supplemented by provisions for individual testing and examination, and for the instruction, in small detachments apart, of those scholars who are proved to fall much below the average in quickness, or to have either special gifts or special defects, or, it may be, both gifts and defects, in thinking and learning, for which a special treatment must be adopted. This cannot be accomplished without such a gradation and multiplication of teaching power as is furnished by our English arrangement of pupil-teacher apprentices. In another respect, also, the German system is at fault. However high the education may go—in the upper

* Report of Education Commission, vol. iv. pp. 239, 240.

classes as well as the lower, and the high schools as well as the elementary—the same teacher teaches all the subjects to the same class. This will certainly never secure the best teaching on the various subjects of a higher grade. It is seldom, for example, that the best teacher of mathematics or of science can teach—or could be trained to teach—in the best manner, or can even teach fairly well, the classical languages and literature, or even the language and literature of his own or any modern country. Just as little is the specially gifted linguist and literary teacher likely, as a rule, to do well as a teacher of mathematics or science.

Nor is it only in the school organization and work that the want of pupil-teachers operates as an injurious defect in the German system of public education. Its want is felt in the training colleges, and in the village homes of boys fitted and intending to become public school-teachers. There is no link in Germany, as there is in England, to connect the boy at school who is to be a teacher with the Training Seminary or Normal College. In a large town, indeed, the boy who wishes to be a teacher may perhaps, after leaving the elementary school, obtain a kind of exhibition, enabling him to pass into a superior public school, and there be educated for two, three, or four years before entering the Seminary or Training College. But the village boy cannot do this. He has to work as best he can, partly at manual labour, and partly at voluntary school learning, or to be entirely dependent on his parents for several years; getting lessons out of school hours from the village teacher. It is evident that this is bungling work. As a matter of fact, one

of the sorest complaints in regard to the Prussian system is the lamentably unfurnished and unfit condition in which the candidates for the office of a teacher come up to the Seminary. On this point the evidence contained in Mr. Pattison's Report to our English Education Commission is ample and conclusive. There is no doubt that, as a class, the candidates for admission to German seminaries are much inferior to those who seek admission to our training colleges.

The success, therefore, of popular education in Germany has been accomplished notwithstanding, at this point, a defect in the national system of education. In this particular, at least, our own English school organization and methods are superior to those which prevail in Germany. But then only a minority of our elementary schools have been thoroughly organized, and only a small minority of the children have attended school with any approach to regularity. No wonder, accordingly, if the actual success and results of German education are superior to those of England.

Let me here summarise the advantages which, in respect to education, Germany possesses over England. I have referred to some of them not only in the last paragraph, but in the first and second chapters of this volume. Here I desire to present a connected view of the circumstances and conditions which have combined to produce the excellent results obtained in Germany by means of school education.

To begin with, the Germans bring to bear on this matter of school education, throughout all classes, and especially the lower, a wonderful and altogether special power and organization of drill and discipline.

Ever since the days of Frederick, that great drill-master, whose life Carlyle, who would never himself have submitted to be drilled, has displayed at such length and with such minuteness, Prussia first, and all Germany after it, has been becoming a more thoroughly and universally drilled and disciplined nation. German respect for law and office appears to be deeper and stronger than even that of English people; while the reign of drill has diffused among Germans a love of uniformity which in this old insular country of diverse races, successive and mutually limited conquests, of parishes and hundreds, of townships, and boroughs, and counties, of growths and usages, of local customs and "common law," has had no place whatever. Hence the Germans submit to be personally registered and regulated and "compelled" as English people would never submit. Besides which (and this is very important), education in Germany was, as we have seen, a matter of Church discipline before it became a matter of civil law. In every parish there was the school as well as the church; and the parish minister expected the children of his flock to be sent to school, as he expected their parents to go to church. In Germany, as in parochial Scotland to-day, the superstructure of State education has been erected on the foundations of education by the Church. The Church and the school have, since the Reformation, been indissolubly associated. For three centuries this has been the case not only as respects Protestant but Roman-Catholic Germany. To this day the rule is that wherever possible, the fact is that almost everywhere, the school in Germany is associated with the Church and congregation; and the pastor or priest of the

church, the parish clergyman of whichever creed, is, by State law, the manager of the school, in harmony with the regulations of the State, and is the legal and assiduous instructor of the children in the catechism and tenets of their faith; their lay teacher giving them, or at any rate giving the Protestant children, instruction in Scripture knowledge and history, under the parish clergyman's direction. Educational compulsion, under such auspices, cannot but have great cogency throughout Germany. Nor is this the whole case. Before the State in Germany directly interfered by means of a compulsory civil law of education, it reorganized, as we have also seen, the social condition of the peasantry. It transformed them, by means of an equitable compromise between the legal rights of the lords of the domain and the necessities of the peasants who were tied to the soil, from a condition of abject serfdom to that of a peasant proprietary, and by so doing, as has already been shown, greatly facilitated the enforcement of universal education on the people. It must be remembered, furthermore, that all this took place before the modern development of manufacturing industry. Before the competitive demands of the modern industrial market for children's labour had made themselves felt and heard, a race of docile, steady, frugal peasants were moulded to the acceptance of a State and Church system of national education under the combined authority and direction of the civil magistrate and of the clergyman, for which they had been prepared by the Church influence and discipline of centuries. Manufactures in Germany came to enrich an educated labouring population, not, as in England, to pour vast stores of wage-money

down the open channels of the shameful waste which is unhappily the too general characteristic of our operative populations. Hence Germany has been able to maintain its education, notwithstanding the demand for juvenile labour ; nay, to turn that very demand into an incitement to make sure of education, by requiring that education shall be an antecedent condition to industrial employment. Luther is reported to have had the highest esteem for the occupation of a teacher, and to have said, that if he were not a divine, he should have chosen to be a schoolmaster. Germany's Reformation, like the great man to whom it was mainly due, was in many respects imperfect, far more imperfect than has been generally understood. But yet we see its fruit to-day in the educational and intellectual condition, perhaps also in the political unity, of the great German people. The Church authority of centuries, the military and civil drill and discipline of generations, the landed possession and security of the great body of the people, the detailed and thorough administration of a compulsory law, established when the character of the people was already, by the other influences to which I have referred, settled and determined, as frugal, thoughtful, and self-respecting, and before the rush of modern life had set in,—these things have enabled the States of Germany completely to enforce the education of all the children of their country for seven or eight consecutive years. It is this fact, not elsewhere to be paralleled, to which, more than to anything else, the special success of German school teaching is due.

Important as are the methods of instruction, the conditions under which instruction are given are yet more important. These conditions, as we have just

seen, are in Germany most favourable, while in our own country, up to the present time, they have been most unfavourable. The net result of all the German conditions is that the German boy is the son of frugal, independent, and well-educated parents and grandparents, and that he is kept for seven or eight years together, week by week, and day by day, without ever missing, except because of proved sickness, or on scanty legal holidays, to his school and his school-work. These advantages are more than sufficient to compensate for serious defects in method.

German teachers have also some special advantages over English in another respect, of no small importance. In the German language pronunciation accurately corresponds to spelling, and all letters have their proper sound. The German weights and measures, moreover, are graded on the decimal scale. These two advantages together represent an important economy of time in a child's education.

The school age in Germany is from six or seven to fourteen. Consequently infant schools, in our English sense of the term, are almost unknown, although there are dames' schools for very young children. So in the factory districts of England, where the law requires children employed in factories to be at school half-time between eight and thirteen, it is found that the children of factory people are not often sent to an inspected school before the age prescribed by law for half-time schooling. There are half-time regulations for children at work in Germany; but in Germany, as in France, the hours both for school and for labour, beginning very early, are much longer than the law permits in England.

In Germany there are no public elementary girls' schools—the schools are mixed—and all public teachers are men. This is a hardship and an evil. In no country is suitable employment for women needed worse than in Germany. In Germany, indeed, and throughout the Continent generally, the recognized sphere of women in all but the superior classes of society, is to drudge in menial toil, either within the house, or in the garden, or in the field. In educated Germany, whatever may be said of the respectability and superiority of the German village school teacher, that village teacher's sister is almost universally devoted to hard and coarse field labour, such as impresses upon her very early an appearance of servile and severe degradation, blots out every trace of refinement, and makes her, whilst still in middle life, appear prematurely old. Indeed, as respects the refinements of domestic life, and all that belongs to the social position of woman, Germany might almost be regarded as a barbarous country compared with England.

It will be seen, from what I have said, that I cannot regard the educational system of Germany as by any means faultless, still less as furnishing a model for public education in a country so dissimilar as our own. Nevertheless, there remains the great fact that Germany is the best-educated country in Europe. It would seem that all the recruits in the war of 1870 could both read and write. A considerable proportion, indeed, of the population both in some parts of South Germany, as Bavaria, and especially in the purely agricultural provinces of North Germany, would appear to lose in after-life the power of writing which they gained at school.

Social conditions will easily account for this. But the power of serviceable reading is all but universal; and, under improved social conditions, the whole population will come to use and retain the power of writing. Perhaps the condition of Switzerland may be superior to that of Germany, or at least fully equal to it, as respects elementary school instruction. But public education is a much greater thing in Germany than in Switzerland. Its sweep is wider, and its sphere much larger. Switzerland is but as a principality; Germany is a great empire. The German system of education embraces a vastly larger area of population and all classes of society in a country where society embraces a very wide range of gradations. It makes a graduated and complete provision for the education alike of the peasant, the townsman, the professional man, and the great possessors of land or money. It includes in its scope not only the primary school, but all the higher schools and universities of the Fatherland. Switzerland does admirably well, better perhaps, in proportion to its means and opportunities, than Germany, not neglecting secondary education, nor University provision and organization. But it is limited by the character of its population, and cannot but be relatively deficient in the organization of secondary and higher education.

The defects and disadvantages of German social and political economy, and civil and political life, as affecting the artisan classes, I indicated in my first chapter. With the new epoch, however, of German unity and internal development and progress, on which the German people has entered, it cannot be doubted that those defects and disadvantages will be

continually lessened ; and that liberty, energy, and life, will be diffused through all classes of the German population.

Meantime, it is well for us English not to forget that, if not in school education, yet in social and domestic education—in all that belongs to sanitary science, to habits of personal delicacy and refinement, to household proprieties and elegances, to health and exercise, to fresh air and fresh water—the English nation are superior to the German or any other Continental people. So also, in regard to culture, I venture to think that the English are still superior to the Germans, notwithstanding our school deficiencies, in clearness and directness of style, in succinct yet polished strength of expression ; and, again, in much belonging to the business of life, in trade, and commerce, and political economy, and, beyond all question, in countless matters of handicraft and mechanism ; all which particulars belong to the real and valuable education of a nation, for thought and action, for life's duties and for personal and national advancement.

From Germany I turn to Switzerland, but can only touch very briefly on the subject of education in that famous and wonderful little country. The influence of the Reformation, and, in the following age, of the Jesuit reaction, gave to Switzerland, as to Germany, its original and fundamental means and agencies of national education, and impressed also upon the population a habit of dutiful regard for schools and learning. It was not, however, till forty years ago that the modern education of Switzerland was organized. "The great development of public education in Switzerland," to quote Mr. Kay,

"dates from 1832, after the overthrow of the old oligarchical forms of cantonal government and the establishment of the present democratic forms."

Zürich, Lausanne, and Geneva take the lead in Switzerland as centres of educational influence. The canton in which the work of educational reform began was Zürich, and some account of its beginning may be read in Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Switzers." The instrument of the reform, rather the revolution, was Scherr, a trained school-teacher from Würtemberg, a teacher, in particular, of deaf mutes to speak articulately. This man initiated in Zürich the new scheme and work of education, and founded the first Training College. He was looked upon by the oligarchs, partly feudalists, and partly manufacturers, as a dangerous revolutionist, and was exiled from Zürich. But now a monument to his memory adorns the city. The work which he began could not be suppressed or arrested. Zürich has ever since taken the lead in education among the cantons of Switzerland. Derived originally from Germany, the system is substantially identical with that of Germany.

Lying between Germany and France, Switzerland of necessity receives ideas largely from both countries. Popular elementary education in France, however, forty years ago, was, as we have seen, but beginning to be moulded into its modern form. Germany, accordingly, and not France, was of necessity the teacher of Switzerland. But in truth Germany was also at the same time affording to France the benefit of its educational science and experience. French education itself is largely, as to principles and methods, derived from Germany.

Zürich, accordingly, rather than Lausanne or Geneva, which are nearer France, and are French in language, leads the van of educational progress in Switzerland. There is, however, no essential distinction between the systems in operation in these three cities, in all of which education is admirably organized. The city of Geneva has to absorb swarms of ignorant Savoyards, and is the capital of a Roman Catholic and somewhat reactionary canton. These circumstances make the work of education in Geneva more difficult than elsewhere. The success obtained, however, is great. On the whole the aspect of education in Lausanne and Geneva is more French and less German than in Zürich, but the differences are merely superficial. The principles and methods are substantially alike throughout. There are, first, the communal schools—these of course in largest number—one to every village, even for every small hamlet, provided and maintained, wholly or chiefly, by the commune ; there are burgher schools in towns, including elementary, real, and superior schools, supported by the towns ; there are cantonal schools—gymnasia and industrial or technical schools—supported by the State, that is, by the canton. There is often a Cantonal University. There is of course a Cantonal Training School or College, and there are institutes of various kinds. The Cantonal Universities, however, are on a small and economical scale ; as yet there is no Federal University.

School life in Switzerland is very long, from six to fourteen or fifteen, and for all who are to follow a profession, from fifteen to twenty-two. It is evident that labour in Switzerland is far less valuable than in this country, and the claims of business to early

attention far less exacting and imperative. At the same time Mr. Arnold has shown, in his Report on Swiss education, that numerous exceptions to the stringent laws on education are continually made. Mr. Dixon, too, notes that occasionally he found that a village school in the more remote districts was shut up for six months in the year. There are, however, very few indeed among the Swiss, even in poor and remote districts, who cannot read and write.

I need not say that Switzerland is a nation of proprietors, of whom the great majority are peasants, and each of whom feels that he holds for himself a share in the national sovereignty. "These labourers," says Mr. Dixon, "have an interest in the soil they till. No ballast for a man like that of having a little earth, his own, about his feet. Though peasants born and bred, they understand their rights. They have been long at school, and know the history of their canton and their country."

The two points as to which Swiss national education differs materially from that of Germany are that it is absolutely free for all, at the public cost, and that the school-teachers are assisted in their work by pupil-teachers, as has been already noted. Of the first of these points I shall speak in the next chapter. As to the second, I have said enough for the present. I shall have to recur to the subject in a later chapter. As, however, I am to pass immediately from this hasty glance at Swiss education to give a glance at popular education in Holland, and as pupil-teachers, whilst wanting in France and Germany, are employed not only in Switzerland, but in Holland, our own country having followed the example of these countries in the employment of them, I wish to offer some

observations on the fact that in two despotic and very bureaucratically regulated countries pupil-teachers are not employed, while in three other and neighbouring countries, all of which (including England) may be regarded as democratic commonwealths, pupil-teachers are employed.

I am aware that I may be met, *in limine*, here by the reminder that in the United States, a democratic republic, pupil-teachers are not employed any more than in France or Germany. There is, however, no objection on principle in America to the employment of pupil-teachers; the difficulty in the way is that school education in the States is neither so highly organized, nor so knit into a system, nor so provided with training colleges, as to allow the institution of pupil-teachers to take root in the country. This state of things prevents the employment of such teachers in the States; to which may perhaps be added the consideration that the employment of school-teachers in the States is neither so remunerative, nor, speaking generally, of so permanent a character as to afford the basis on which such an institution can rest, or to attract well-educated youths into its apprenticeship.

The organization of pupil-teachers harmonises naturally with the genius of a people which is, in all ways, trained by the laws and institutions of the country to an early development of the sense of self-reliance and personal responsibility, to civil and political power, and privilege, and trust. "The child is father of the man." "In Germany," says Mr. Horace Mann, in a passage of his "Educational Tour," of which I have quoted part on a preceding page, "the Government steps in to take care of the

subject almost as much as the subject takes care of his cattle. The subject has no officers to choose; no inquiry into the character of candidates to make; no vote to give. He is not asked where a road shall be laid, or a bridge shall be built. The ecclesiastical authority plans a church which he must build; his spiritual guide prepares a confession of faith all ready for his signature. He is directed alike how he must obey his king and worship his God."*

Mr. Pattison, also, speaks, in a passage from which I quoted in my first chapter, of the German youth of fourteen "coming into contact with the social order as it is arranged for him," when "that which was docility in the child develops into stupidity, submissiveness, and a mechanical routine existence." He describes him as growing up to be "the creature of forms, walking leisurely by rule," and "pursuing, with a sort of military precision, the track of his profession." Such is said to be the fundamental character of the German *Bauer*—"happy with his pipe, the society of his friends, the gossip of the town, and his few acres of land," but knowing nothing of that modern form of civilisation with which are associated "political struggle, commercial enterprise, fortunes rapidly made or lost, ships, colonies, European interests."† Such a nation will more easily and naturally furnish exact, well-instructed, every way excellent soldiers, than a stock and staple of self-reliant citizens. In such a nation to give boys some measure of independence in school-teaching, in teaching their junior fellows, and in

* Abridged from quotation by Mr. Pattison. Report of Education Commission, vol. iv. p. 243.

† Ibid.

school discipline, would scarcely be consistent. "I say," remarks Mr. Arnold, "that the Prussian people, under its elaborate system of education, has become a studious people, a docile people, a well-informed people, if you will; but also a somewhat pedantic, a somewhat sophisticated people. I say that this pedantry, this formalism, takes away something from a people's vital strength. I say that a people loses under them much of the genial, natural character, much of the rude, primitive vigour which are the great elementary force of nations."* The grand triumphs of Germany as a military nation must not be allowed to mislead our judgment as to the points now in question. The drill of the nation is perfect, their intelligent docility of the highest order, their physical condition good and vigorous, the intellect of their higher classes most highly trained and developed. Under able, despotic wielding, such a nation cannot but be a magnificent military institution and engine. But the Germans are not a people in whom individuality of character comes strongly out, or self-reliance and self-government are highly developed. In such a nation teachers in their teens are not likely to be employed or encouraged, even as apprentices. It is a people regulated by bureaux and educated by ecclesiastical consistories. In Switzerland the ecclesiastical authorities immediately inspect—not, however, alone—and largely direct the schools. But the democratic lay spirit makes itself paramount in every department. In Switzerland each youth feels that he is growing up to be a sovereign citizen.

France is a country in which detailed self-govern-

*"Popular Education in France," p. 107.

ment may be said to be almost unknown. The *maire* and the *curé* manage the school. The prefect of the department is absolute over all that are within his jurisdiction. The Minister of the Interior prompts and regulates the prefects. The University of France, which has been scarcely more than another name for a combined council of ecclesiastics and despotically governing statesmen, has absolutely controlled all the education of France. In such a country the pupil-teacher system would be as little likely to spring up as in Germany. There is no intermediate period between pupilage and the age of strictly regulated authority. The teacher is, in truth, almost as much under tutors and governors as the scholar. The period of life during which a youth is learning at the same time to govern himself and others, and thus to grow into a responsible man, fit to be trusted with authority, and capable of using it with discretion, does not exist in France. All citizens are always *in statu pupillari*. Neither ecclesiastics nor statesmen were likely, therefore, in France, any more than in Germany, to adopt, by choice, the pupil-teacher system. Perhaps, however, it may be found necessary in both countries, some day, to adopt it. Doubtless German and French boys—their boyhood being not yet out of them—could well be trained into pupil-teachers, if the method were but once adopted.

I come now to Holland. Holland is a Presbyterian and essentially a Protestant country. Roman Catholics, however, constitute an appreciable element in its population, especially in certain districts. Till the beginning of the present century all

the education for the poor in Holland was voluntary. The Protestants had made good provision in quantity, if not in quality, for their poor. In the last years of the last and the early years of the present century, a voluntary society (the Society for the Public Good) did very much for the improvement of popular education. In 1806 the Government effectively interposed, under the guidance of the famous educationist, Van Der Ende, in the way of providing effective inspection for all public schools, and requiring certificates of competency from all teachers as respected religious instruction. The law of 1806 went on the principle of providing in the schools, on Saturdays, when Jewish children were absent, effective unsectarian Biblical instruction for the children, especially out of the Gospels, and of arranging with the pastors of the churches for dogmatic and special religious instruction to be given on Sundays. State and Church being strictly united, the day-schools and Sunday-schools were also in close union, and each worked with the other. Under this system which lasted for half a century, primary education in Holland was wonderfully developed. First a system of pupil-teacher apprenticeship was organized, and afterwards this was crowned and completed by the provision of Normal Colleges.

In 1848, however, State and Church in Holland were separated. As a consequence, the Roman Catholics, unable to secure for themselves the right of separate denominational school-instruction, insisted on the complete secularisation of the school system. They complained that the existing unsectarian Christian influence in the schools was expressly Biblical and virtually Protestant, and therefore in-

volved a violation of their religious rights. The Rationalistic party in the press and in the legislature combined, as to this point of contention, with the Roman Catholics, and, accordingly, in 1857, popular and public education in Holland became secular, or at any rate Christian only in a very high and vague general sense.

The denominations, however, often, in some way or other, get their ends, especially the Roman Catholic communion. It is almost impossible, in fact, to work a purely secular, as we have seen it to be to work a truly and thoroughly unsectarian, system of public education. The Roman Catholics are not allowed to have Roman Catholic schools; but they compass part at least of their object in another way. They are found living very much together in villages and town districts. Hence they have, as a class, to choose their school-teacher; the teacher being in Holland not appointed from above, as in France, but by a popularly elected local board or committee. Baron Donald Mackay informs me that Roman Catholics, in such circumstances, are invariably careful and resolute to elect none but a Roman Catholic teacher for their school. They thus secure on their side, at least, the personal religious profession and the personal influence of the teacher.

I have already had occasion to remark that, unlike the popular masses in England, but like the ancient and truly indigenous Scottish lowland population of all classes, the lower classes in Holland are all church-going people, and never omit to have their children instructed by their pastors, and confirmed at the proper age. This is no consequence of the modern and highly developed popular education of

Holland. It is the basis of character and quality on which that education has been established. The lower classes in Holland generally resemble, and seem to have for generations resembled, in respectability, economy, prudence, respect for Christian profession and worship, our middle classes in this country. Perfect cleanliness and excellent thrift appear to be almost universal; there is scarcely any such thing as pauperism, and Christian civilisation of a sterling quality appears, except, perhaps, in some of the country villages, where there is more poverty and depression than elsewhere, to be diffused among all classes of the people. For the combination, in fact, of wealth and suitable culture in the higher classes, with comfort, intelligence, and adequate education and information in the lower classes, there is no country in Europe to compare with Holland.

Public education in Holland being secular, it is found impossible to make it compulsory. Nevertheless, without any compulsory law, education has taken a most effective hold of the whole people. Holland has, in fact, all the conditions favourable to a true and thorough national education of which I spoke in my first chapter. The conditions of land-tenure, the hereditary character of the people, and of their home-life from generation to generation, literature, cheap and free, civil and political self-government, all are conducive to the best educational results. The one thing which exists in a less degree than elsewhere is something important indeed but not intrinsic—the motives and incentives to enterprise supplied by growing commerce and empire, or by unexhausted territorial wealth. In these respects Holland is, by no fault of its own, in its decadence. The

fine and genuinely prosperous condition of the people is, therefore, all the more admirable.

The apprentice-teachers of Holland furnished the material out of which its excellent supply of teachers was trained and developed even before—in 1816—Training Colleges were established, and which, being so amply provided, made it inevitable that those colleges, when established, should prove a great success, as they have done, carrying the excellence of the primary teaching science and practice of Holland to a pitch, perhaps, not to be equalled elsewhere. These apprentice-teachers furnished Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth with the original of his pupil-teacher system for England.

"I have seen," says Mr. Arnold, "no primary schools worthy to be matched with those of Holland. In Prussia education may be even more widely diffused, but nowhere, probably, has it such thorough soundness and solidity. It is impossible to regard it without admiration."

The general outline of the provisions for education in Holland resembles the system established elsewhere on the Continent. But there is a specific and important difference as respects the provision of inspectors and inspection. This and the pupil-teacher system together may, perhaps, be regarded as constituting the distinctive features of the Dutch system. In Germany and Switzerland the pastors of the churches have preponderant authority as managers or inspectors of schools, in France they have large authority. In Holland, whilst they are by no means ignored or set aside in the school management, the work of inspection is organized and carried out quite apart from them, by an independent and very

numerous corps of highly qualified, disinterested, and independent gentlemen. Their visits are frequent, and their examinations and inspections are very searching. "Take care," said a venerable Dutch authority to M. Cousin, in 1836, "how you choose your inspectors; they are men whom you ought to look for with a lantern in your hand." "Inspection in Holland," says Mr. Arnold, "was organized with a force and completeness which it has attained nowhere else."

Holland is almost entirely an industrial and commercial country. There is a scanty aristocracy of rank or landed estate; there is but a small number of families that possess, in hereditary succession, such a combination of leisure, wealth, and social status, as ensures a permanent and traditional national culture of wide range and high excellence. Nor is the monotonous and humid territory of Holland so favourable to literary refinement and varied accomplishments of learning as it is to utilitarian tastes and pursuits. Hence it is not wonderful that those who have spoken most highly of the primary education of Holland, as Cuvier, Cousin, and Arnold, should all agree that Dutch secondary and higher education is of quite an inferior character. In this respect Holland seems to be inferior to Switzerland, and is certainly inferior to Germany and France. It is, however, of public elementary school education, of popular education, almost exclusively, that I am writing. As respects this education, Holland would appear to be superior to any country in Europe. There may be a somewhat larger number of grown persons in Holland than in Germany unable to read or write; but the

people generally have a better, more practical, more serviceable education, and they turn it to better account, on the whole, in the active duties, and especially the social and public relations of civil and political life—life in the family, in business, and in the Commonwealth.

CHAPTER V.

FREE EDUCATION.

IT is not an easy thing to determine how far it is proper for Government to interfere in regard to the education of the people. Five-and-twenty years ago a large proportion of those political partisans in England who desired to be considered, in a special sense, the friends and upholders of individual liberty and the leaders of enlightened progress, maintained resolutely and even passionately that the State could have nothing to do with education any more than with religion, and that the provision of education, as of the material commodities of life, might safely be left, and at all events must perforce be left, to "the law of supply and demand." Now, a considerable proportion of the same party insist that the State should alone do the whole work of education for the nation, and that the education, so provided, should be free, secular of course, and compulsory. So much easier is it to strike upon Scylla in the drive of party controversy, or to be sucked into Charybdis by the force of popular reaction, than to steer the wise and true course through the mazes of a subject at once intricate and of pressing importance.

The true doctrine on the subject has, however,

been laid down by Mr. Mill in his Essay on Liberty. It is the duty of the State to enforce universally a certain minimum of education, and to do everything towards testing and facilitating the supply of education in every kind and of every grade by voluntary agencies that a wise and impartial Government can do; it may be necessary, also, for the Government to step in itself and take direct action towards supplying education in cases of educational destitution which cannot otherwise be met; but the less Government has to do with providing education itself the better. "If the Government would make up its mind to require for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of providing one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees of the poorer classes of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them. The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education; which is a totally different thing." "An education established and controlled by the State should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the Government undertook the task; then, indeed, the Government may, as the less of two great evils, take upon itself the business of

schools and universities, as it may that of joint-stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry, does not exist in the country. But, in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under Government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by a law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray the expense."

I cannot doubt that Mr. Mill has here laid down the just principles on which all questions relating to national education ought to be settled. If things were as they ought to be there would be no need for a general system of Government grants or local rates in aid of schools, though public examinations would still be necessary. There would be no protected class of teachers, with special professional and pecuniary privileges; but all, whether public or private, would compete on equal terms, and their work be tested by the same examinations. School fees would be proportionate to the actual cost and value of the education. School teachers would pay the just value of their own training. Unfortunately, however, as yet this nation has been, up to the present time, "in so backward a state," as to school education generally, "that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the Government undertook the task."

There was, then, a truth at the bottom of the position as to national education held by the ultra-voluntary party five-and-twenty years ago, although they knew not how to define and limit it, and, in

consequence, applied it so blunderingly as to bring upon themselves a decisive practical refutation of their strong assertions, and to drive many of them, in defeat and confusion, to the contrary and much more radically untenable position which they hold to-day. There are still amongst us, however, men who, having been moderate and wise in 1846, remain wise and practical to-day. Dr. Binney refused, thirty years ago, to unite with those who deprecated and denounced all Government interference in matters of education. To-day he equally refuses to join with those around him who would do away with all voluntary action or responsibility in regard to public education. He declares that, in his judgment, it is no more a primary duty of the State to provide a child with school education than to supply a child with bread ; though it may, in special circumstances, become the duty of the State to do both the one and the other, as it is certainly its duty to make sure that the child has what is absolutely needful, whether in the way of bread or of schooling.*

But, if these principles are right, free education for the whole people at the cost of the State must be altogether an untenable claim, must be an unwarrantable demand. I know, indeed, of no theory, of no principle, on which such a claim can be supposed to rest, with any show of stability or authority, except the communistic theory or principle, such as was ideally exemplified in Plato's "Republic," and was to some extent practically carried out at Sparta, and such as forms at this day a part of the platform on which the International Society takes its

* See "The British School." By T. Binney. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

stand. This Communism of the International Society proclaims that not the family, but the individual, is the unit in the national system of society; that the State is not built up of families, that the nation is a mere numerical aggregate of individuals. It denies parental claims; nay, it denounces them, and even reviles the family institution, as selfish and tyrannical. The State, it maintains, must be the mother and nurse of all its children; these must be rescued from the hands of their natural parents, and must be brought up by the common wisdom and bounty of the State for the common good. Such ideas as these are the common stock of Continental Communists, and with these ideas our working-men and their trades'-unions are more deeply infected, though for the most part unconsciously, than any except a few of their most designing and dangerous leaders understand. Here we have the real source and inner meaning of those ideas as to necessary and universal uniformity and gratuitousness of education, which have been so loudly insisted upon by some recent educational agitators. Many of the ostensible leaders in this agitation are doubtless ignorant of the forces which press them from behind, of the true source of the inspiration and afflatus which seems to surround them and bear them up and carry them forward. It would be well for them to examine seriously into the subject.

In April, 1870, I had an instructive exemplification of what I have now been stating. I was passing down the Rue des Saints Pères, in Paris, and was attracted by a bookseller's shop, of which the designation was, "The Library of Social Science." In the window of this shop I was struck to see the

announcement that there was lying there for signature a petition to the Chambers on behalf of universal, compulsory, and gratuitous education. I went to the shop and bought two of the publications on social science, which were lying there. I found in both of them, taught in the most unblushing and audacious manner, the view which I have been describing; the foulest contempt and abuse poured upon the marriage institute and family life, and the doctrine expounded and insisted on that the individual exists only for the State; that there is no such thing as family sanctity or family rights; that the State must rescue the units of the nation, the children who happen to appear upon the earth, from all parental pretensions, and educate them gratuitously, compulsory, philosophically, on the ideal plan and pattern, for the State. Nowhere else in Paris did I see any announcement as to universal, compulsory, gratuitous education. I found after this a meaning and a context for this demand of gratuitous universal education, which I had not seen before.

About two years after this incident, I heard Professor Fawcett, in the House of Commons, deliver a speech in an education debate, raised on a resolution of Mr. Dixon's, in reference to the 25th clause of Mr. Forster's Education Act. I found that the connection between the principles of the International Society and the demands of the ultra-Birmingham school in this country, on the subject of education, had not escaped the attention of the Professor. The following were his words on that occasion: "He did not wish," he said, "to enter upon the religious difficulty, but he trusted the House would permit him to insist on what he regarded as by far the

most serious objection to the system of the payment of the fees by School Boards, which offered such a premium to free education that, if the clause were continued in force, and if the central authority did not exercise a greater control than heretofore, a system of free education would be established throughout the country. There was nothing he should more regret than such a result. In the first place, it would weaken parental responsibility, the most valuable of all social virtues; secondly, it would extend what had already produced sufficiently baneful effects, viz., the taxing of prudent individuals still more heavily than at present for the sake of the improvident; and, thirdly, it would increase the tendency which was growing up in this country of people making others pay for that which they ought to pay for themselves. This tendency he regarded as the prominent characteristic of modern Socialism. It should not be forgotten that free education was the first plank in the programme of the International, which was pervaded throughout by the same principle. The State was to provide land for the people at a low price; the State was to provide houses for them at a cheap rate; the State was to lend capital to co-operative associations; and if this demand for free education were not resisted, encouragement would be given to Socialism in its most baneful form."*

The point which I wish to settle just now, in order to clear the ground for other considerations, is whether free and universal education by the State, and according to a standard and methods to be determined by the State, is or is not a principle of right, does or does not represent a claim which the

* See the Report in the *Times* for March 6th, 1872.

State is bound to enforce both on behalf of itself and of the child, that is, of every child. I am not now speaking of what is to be done on behalf of those whom their parents neglect, or who have no parents, or whom their parents are unable to educate. Let education, up to a certain minimum, be admitted at once to be a necessary of life, which, like food and clothing, must be provided for the child at the public cost, if effectual provision cannot be made to provide it otherwise. The analogy here is simple and direct. It is not yet claimed by any English League that all children are not only to be taught, but to be fed and clothed, at the cost of the State. Doubtless, on the principles of Communism, this also ought to follow. But our question is that of education. I know that many who would not dream of going the whole length with Communism, and who probably have no conception that they are already standing with one foot at least on the ground of Communism, do claim that the State is bound to provide free, compulsory, universal education for all the children of the State in common schools. I wish to ask those who hold this opinion whether they have ever carefully considered on what ground they can base such a principle ; whether it is not opposed not only to all the doctrines of political economy—I have quoted against it the two most distinguished living authorities* among Englishmen on the principles of political economy—but to the fundamental principles of our whole social economy.

The question, as I conceive it, resolves itself into this. Is the individual, or is the family, the unit,

* Whilst revising this sheet I hear the mournful intelligence of Mr. Mill's decease.

the germ-cell, in the fabric and texture of the nation and of human society? Is the family a sacred and necessary element—is it the essential element—in civilised human communities, or is it not? If it be, the parent must still be held and left responsible for providing for the wants of his children, until they are able to maintain and guide themselves, and for their education as for their other wants. Parents must needs be the first educators of their children, whether for good or for evil. How long, on the principles I am combating, ought children to be left under their parent's care? At what age is the State to take them from the charge of their parents, and assume the responsibility of their education? The earliest influences are pre-eminently important in the tincturing of disposition and the moulding of character. It seems to me that the principle of State education, once frankly and fully adopted, must lead to all the lengths of ancient pagan theory, and that children, as soon as weaned, ought to be taken from their mother and placed in the public nursery. If we are not prepared to go such lengths, then we must concede that the parental right, duty, and responsibility in regard to the education of the child, is a necessary element in the problem of national education, an element which cannot for a moment be lost sight of. The parental right is a sacred thing, sacred by Divine and human law.

At the same time this right needs, doubtless, to be limited and conditioned by other rights—by the right of the child, by the duty and claim of the State. The parent must be made to act upon his right, the right reserved for him sacredly, and to act rightly upon it. If he cannot, he must to the needful

extent be aided. If he is morally incompetent, another or others must be authorised and enabled to exercise the right for him. Society has a claim, a right, a duty in regard to every child, less direct, indeed, than that of the parent, less self-evident, less associated with sacred thoughts, and with ties which ought to be both tender and holy, but not less real or less binding.

Every parent and every child is not only a member of a family, but of the nation. The parent does not exist for himself, but for society. So the child is not the property of the parent, nor does he exist only for him. Not only must his evil education and his ill-doing transcend, in their effects, the family circle, but his powers for good are intended to be called forth and exercised on behalf of the world in which his lot is cast, of the human society in which he is to dwell. The parent, in the authority which he exercises over the child, is but a steward and guardian acting on behalf of God and of the nation. The nation, it is true, cannot claim an absolute right and authority in all matters over either parent or child. It cannot coerce the conscience, and has no right to make the attempt. It cannot enter the sphere of religious conviction, or interfere between God and the conscience of either parent or child. But it can claim to take cognisance of almost all except this, if there is any liability of injustice or wrong being inflicted by the stronger upon the weaker, by the parent upon the child of tender years. And, in particular, if the parent is either unable or unwilling to afford his child such an education as is necessary to restrain him from crime, to elevate him above pauperism, and to fit him for discharging his

duty as a member of the commonwealth—much more if he is educating him in a contrary direction—it becomes the right and the duty of the State to interpose on behalf not only of the child's just claims, but of its own well-being, and to take measures for providing and imparting such an education.

The relation of the parent to the child is, so far at least as regards this life, transitory ; that of the child to the nation, permanent. Parents presently die ; but society remains. Family life is tributary to national life ; the latter encloses the former, both preceding and surviving it. Family training is intended to prepare for national life and civil and political responsibilities. The less, then, within the limits already laid down, must be regulated by the greater. The well-being of society, of the nation, must, if need be, assert its claims and authority as to the training of those who are to be its constituent members, no less than the peace and order of the family must be enforced in the due subordination and instruction of its members. If parents are the rightful guardians of the peace and morality of the family, so the legislative and administrative authorities of the nation are the rightful guardians of the interests of society. And as that parent would be rightly blamed who demanded morality of his children but never taught it them ; who required an orderly and peaceable behaviour, and yet suffered them to associate with disorderly companions, and to run wild at the time when they might be under salutary training ; so a State which sets up strict laws, and punishes for the breach of them, and yet suffers thousands of those who are to be its citizens to grow up in ignorance and immorality, without

taking any means to reclaim and instruct them, must be liable to the severest condemnation.

There devolves upon the State, accordingly, a secondary responsibility in regard to the education of the children of the people. The State is bound, at the least, to take all means for ensuring that every child shall receive such an education as is needful to furnish him with the power of self-development, that he may be able to advance in the scale of intellectual and moral, *i.e.*, of *human* progress. I think, also, that we may well go a step farther, still moving in harmony with Mr. Mill's principles, and affirm that, besides taking means to ensure for every child such a minimum of education as I have now defined, the State may take further action, with a view to improving the education of the nation generally, if the general standard of education be, and, under the operation of ordinary causes, be likely to remain, far inferior to what it is desirable it should be, for the development of the national mind and resources. But any such action should, I cannot but think, be taken in strict harmony with the principles Mr. Mill has laid down in the chapter of his essay from which I have already quoted.* The integrity of family life and parental responsibility, and the rights of individual liberty, self-development, and enterprise, are absolutely sacred, and must be held inviolate. The *doctrinaire* demands of free national education are fatally opposed to both.

These things being settled, there will remain no ground on which a plea for free and universal national education could be raised except that of convenience and expediency. If it were possible so to

* "On Liberty," chap. v.

do the work in common that all classes should be provided with a suitable and adequate education, by means of a general educational provision, of such completeness and flexibility as to meet the whole case of the nation in all its sections, and so also as to leave full liberty of individual enterprise, invention, and development to the teachers, and as to ensure that each family or each citizen should contribute towards the general cost of the total education provided something like his fair share, in proportion to the benefit he derives from it, it might be a very desirable thing to provide such a general education for the whole nation, or it might not. There would be something to say, much, probably, to say, on both sides of such a question. But then the conception is but a dream ; it could never be realised, and nobody could imagine its practicability. We might conceive a village in New England a century ago with its simple social organization, its common level of rank, its superabundance of waste land, its dearth of teachers, finding it a very economical and everyway convenient and practicable plan to provide a common school, to assign land for its maintenance, in whole or in part, and to arrange that any final deficiencies which might at any time be left on the school-fund should be charged on the parents of the scholars in proportion to the number of children sent to school. But to provide a suitable and adequate education for the whole English people out of a common fund is quite another thing, and one which could not be accomplished at the same time efficiently and equitably, nor at all without enormous public expenditure and waste.

It must be remembered always that free education in a great country like England, must mean educa-

tion free for all classes. It is impossible to draw the line between class and class. The skilled workman in England is in proportion far richer, as a rule, than the professional man; the factory operative, with his children at work, than the clergyman with his children to send to school; the foundryman than the striving physician. If schools and free education are provided for the operatives, they must assuredly be provided for the professional classes; if for the mechanic, for the retail tradesman; if for the small tradesman, for the large; if for the shopkeeper, also for the merchant and manufacturer. There must be national provision of elementary schools, and grammar schools, and high schools. The graduation must be perfect, the system complete. To adjust the incidence of taxation and of rating equitably would be impossible.

Gas and water are provided in common for the community, town by town. They could not otherwise be provided. But wherever possible, and as far as possible, the rating charge is by meter and according to consumption. Moreover, as yet these primary, material, prosaic wants, wants which may be mechanically met with scientific accuracy, have been mostly met by private enterprise, and on ordinary commercial principles. If they should come to be universally supplied by means of municipal organization, the reason will only be that gasworks and waterworks are in the nature of a monopoly, and that the conditions of free trade which ought to accompany all private enterprise do not really apply in these cases. There is no branch of industry, on the contrary, in which there might be and ought to be, with great advantage to the commonwealth and to the cause of human progress, freer competition and

larger scope for private enterprise and genius than in teaching. Besides which (and this touches the very core of the question), in these cases, as I have said, the cost of the consumption is paid for by the consumer according to meter and rate. The postal service is a matter of public provision and regulation. This, however, could not be otherwise. All the conditions, in the case of the Post Office, are in contrast with the case of schools and school-teaching. And, in this case also, the cost of the department is paid for by the public in precise proportion to their use and advantage of the department, in its various provisions and arrangements.

The State pays for its State law and public justice, and for its army and navy. These are charges upon the community in self-defence against a common foe, and they are such as cannot but be met out of the common State fund. It is impossible to charge them on criminals or foreign nations. These charges, also, it is hoped, will diminish at least relatively, rather than increase. Whereas, the demands of national education must become continually larger and more comprehensive and exacting. Besides which, the laws of competition and free trade, considerations of individual sympathy and energy and inventive genius, have no application whatever to the provisions which are made for representing sovereign justice and vindicating the majesty of violated law.

It appears to me that the supply of medical attendance and medicine in time of sickness, is at least as much a need to be met by common public provision as the supply of education. Nay, I see not why families might not as properly be fed out of public stores as educated out of the public purse.

The State provision of poor-relief affords, indeed, an analogy in favour of providing school aid for the really indigent and needy, but against providing for those who have the means of paying for the education of their own children. Moreover, as pauperism ought to diminish continually in a wisely ordered and prosperous State, so ought the public provision of education in cases of indigence to be a continually diminishing burden.

If it be alleged that a free education is necessary in order to ensure universal education, the answer is that all experience is against such an assumption. Education is free in New York, yet there are few cities in the world where education is more partial, or school attendance so irregular. Education is free in Switzerland, and not free in Germany, yet school attendance is more strictly regular in Germany than in Switzerland. In 1848, an experiment was made in Germany of free education, this being a demand of that revolutionary time. But on trial it was found not to work, and fees were restored, small, it is true, but more than equivalent in proportion to wages and prices to the fees which, on an average, have been charged in the public elementary schools of England. Parents, as a rule, care more for the education of their children, and send them more regularly to school, when they have to pay for their schooling. It could hardly be otherwise. Teachers also teach better when the success of the school depends in part, whether directly or indirectly, on the pecuniary results which their teaching produces.

It is true that free education has been a success in Switzerland, but let the conditions of society in Switzerland be considered. Switzerland is a de-

mocratic republic, in which all classes stand on a perfect level, and are equally depositaries of the common sovereign power. Besides this political equality, there is, through a great part of Switzerland, a real social equality. The lowest grade is wanting in Switzerland—all may be said to be proprietors, all to be civil and political integers, all to meet everywhere on equal terms. There are very few that are wealthy, and none that belong to any sort of special aristocracy. Each commune, therefore, and each town provides in common for its common wants. And, after all, Switzerland is a very small country, as well as peculiarly primitive, and, though not indigent, really poor. Such a country can afford no example for England. Besides which, Switzerland is educationally dependent on Germany. Its light and life, its ideas and developments, educationally, are, as Mr. Hepworth Dixon shows us, derived confessedly from Germany.

Free education prevails at present in most of the United States of America. I know not, however, how any one can pretend that in the States, so far as it has prevailed, it has proved to be a success. It was an inevitable expedient, as I have shown, in the early times of the settlements. Where the people have remained under anything like their primitive conditions, the common school has proved a serviceable expedient, and, therefore, a fair success. It answers best in country towns, and, nowadays, in the Western States. It becomes unsuitable in proportion as the conditions of American civilisation become more various and complex and highly developed. Where there is much low poverty and also much accumulated wealth, much variety of taste and

culture, much hereditary refinement, and wide differences of religious belief, there the free and common school system proves to be increasingly unsuitable.

In America itself, in fact, a movement is beginning to stir against the system as both inadequate and unfair. By far the largest and most popular Church in the United States is the Episcopal Methodist Church, which represents the main branch of American Methodism, as derived from John Wesley, through Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury. It is in this large communion that the most distinct and significant stirrings of this movement have taken place; and the neighbourhood in which they have made themselves apparent is that eastern sea-board which contains the oldest and most highly developed social life in the States, and of which New York and Boston may be regarded as the chief centres.

It is in the Eastern States—where the Roman Catholics are numerous, where the extremes of European society can be most nearly paralleled, where culture and pauperism, keen intelligence and besotted ignorance and passion, alike abound—that the controversy has originated. In these States the pressure of those difficulties which have produced the controversy must increase from year to year.

At the close of 1871, the *New York Christian Advocate*—the official organ of Methodism in the States, a paper of the widest circulation and of very great influence—published an article on "Sectarian Schools," which developed the views to which I have referred. The *New York Methodist*, an "independent" Methodist journal, which leads the Methodist "opposition," took strong exceptions to the article. The *Zion's Herald*, however, an influential

Methodist journal, published at Boston, edited at that time by the Rev. Dr. Haven, who has since been appointed a Bishop, sustained the arguments and views of the *Advocate.* The occasion of the *Advocate's* article had been a resolution, passed in the New York Methodist Educational Convention, disapproving of certain State appropriations towards the support of *denominational education.* "That resolution," says the Boston paper, "will yet return to plague the inventors. It was not right. The State should exercise its judgment on all such cases. The State in all ages has helped Church education. It probably will in all ages to come. Refusal to do it gives education to the infidels, who get help on the plea that they are not sectarian, as Cornell" (University) "has done, and Harvard, while the best schools are unaided. Better help the College of the Holy Cross than Cornell; better Christ, with Mary and the Pope even, than no Christ at all. The article (in the *Advocate*) was timely, and the Convention next year should rescind its very erroneous and dangerous resolve."

Three weeks later there appeared in the columns of the *Advocate* an elaborate leading article, undoubtedly from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Curry, the chief editor, entitled "Education—Secular and Religious."

In this article the relations of the family, in the first place, and of the Church, in the second place, to the education of the people, are insisted upon; and the relations of the State are also defined, in their bearing upon both family and Church. Schools are said to be "the State's agencies for helping parents to secure the requisite secular learning for their

children, or, in case of parental neglect, to supplement such lack of service." "It is not the prerogative of the State," the writer says, "to impose any religious forms upon any one of its citizens, whether that form be to kiss the crucifix, or to kneel as the host is carried by, or to listen to the reading of the Bible. *By common consent any of these may be done in a common school*, but never by legal force, or against the remonstrance of a respectable portion of the parties concerned. Common schools are not designed to operate as *specifically* religious agencies; and if, by reason of any tolerated religious observance, violence is done to the conscience or the prejudices of any, a civil wrong is inflicted, and the objected-to practice should cease. We would, therefore, have the reading of the Bible or the offering of prayer observed in our public schools only where it may be done without exciting any strong opposition."

From these remarks it is plain that the writer would not be prepared to object on principle even to a system as denominational, and as favourable to Roman Catholicism on the one hand and Presbyterianism on the other, as the Irish National system; provided there were the necessary safeguards for religious liberty. It is still more evident that he would approve of the principles of our existing system in this country, with its various classes of schools and its universal conscience clause.

The writer passes from the case of the common schools to that of public educational *boarding* institutions—"boarding-schools, asylums, and reformatories." In all these cases, he argues, the school is also "the home," and there must, therefore, be a "specifically religious element" in it, or, in other

words, the school must, to use his language, be "sectarian." He contends that all these schools ought to receive the bounty of the State, in proportion to the work they have done. In the State of New York even private boarding-schools do now receive State gratuities "in proportion to the number and the grades of the pupils taught in them." The writer maintains that this is right. He defends the appropriation of State revenues towards the support of "sectarian" colleges of all sorts. He laments that in the State of New York the infidel Cornell University receives much the largest amount of State help, the plea being that it is "non-sectarian." He states the fact that most of the "sectarian" colleges of the United States generally receive "public aid, wisely given, and properly accepted." He refers, with high approval, to the case of a Methodist college lately established at Syracuse, towards the completion of which the city voted one hundred thousand dollars, leaving it nevertheless as purely Methodist and "sectarian" as if the money had not been voted.

Some months after the publication of the article from which I have been quoting, Dr. Curry addressed a letter, in his own name, to "Dexter A. Hawkins, Esq.," a high American educational authority, on the "School System," in which he still further develops his views. This letter was printed as a first leader in the *Advocate*. I do not feel it necessary, however, at present to add anything to the evidence I have brought forward. It is enough to show that the American institutions do not in America itself satisfy the necessities of the case; that just in proportion as the condition of the States, or any of them, approximates to that of England, it is found

necessary to make concessions to denominational varieties of agency and to private enterprise, and that, so far as the national system is pressed into uniformity, it becomes unsuitable to the condition of those States and cities which most resemble England and its towns in respect of their population.

The lesson taught by this controversy is that the only escape from a State-maintained or State-aided denominational system of national education is in the principles of voluntaryism, and that a universal State-supported system must be largely denominational. The claims put forward by Dr. Curry, including as they do, a demand on behalf not only of denominational but of private schools, are very like a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory of State free and universal education.

I have still another consideration on this subject to mention, which cannot but, I think, have weight in England. At present our Endowed Schools Commission is spreading far and wide the benefits of old endowments. It has but begun its work. But the little, comparatively, which has been done, shows how the present scheme will work. By means of a most economical and stimulating application of endowments, it will diffuse the benefits of education over wide sections of society, in such a way as to reach and help the most really needy and deserving cases. But, suppose the Commission proceeded upon the principle of universal free education—in grammar schools, and high schools, and boarding schools; free education for all classes, higher or lower, how little and insignificant would its modicum of work and benefit become! Its range would be restricted within the narrowest limits; its benefits would be

altogether doubtful; its present discriminating aid and high stimulating power and influence would be done away. The *ignis fatuus* of free education for England appears to be as mischievous and misleading a diversion of the public mind, and delusion of energetic and resolute men, as this age has known.

The observations which I have been making, however, when regard is had to the actual system of public elementary schools in England, may naturally appear to be not altogether pertinent or to be obscure of application, or, perhaps, to admit of a negative practical reply. It may be said that, if they are good against a system of free national education, they are equally good against a system of schools of which, as now in this country, the expense is, to a considerable extent, borne by the State; that, if conclusive at all, they are equally conclusive against State aid generally, whether it wholly or only partly meets the expense of the schools, all such aid being *pro tanto* a State gratuity, in the case of all who can afford to pay wholly for the education of their children, and, being in any and every case a gratuity to the extent to which the State aid is larger in amount than was strictly and absolutely necessary to supplement the means of payment possessed by the parent.

I am not at all concerned to deny, in general, this conclusion. The arguments which have been presented are, as I venture to think, in the abstract and on principle, conclusive against any contribution by the State of aid or bounty to school, or teachers, or parents, beyond what the actual necessities of the parent justifies. Accordingly, it appears to me, that the present vast and intricate system of State aid to

schools, whether voluntary schools or local rate schools (School Board Schools), and also that the present system of local rating for general purposes of popular education, can only be regarded as abnormal and temporary. I do not deny the necessity in the past, or for some considerable time to come, of such aid. It is now many years since I gave my own reasons, not only for approving, in general, the measures taken by the Privy Council to aid and promote popular education, but for concluding that, to accomplish the work so urgently needed, it would be necessary to recur to local rating and local municipal or parochial direction and oversight. But yet, so far as this system has involved pecuniary aid and bounty from the State, the necessity has arisen from the faulty and abnormal condition of the nation in regard to popular education. The demand for schools had to be created. The people had almost to be bribed, in the first instance, to send their children to school. All popular education, worthy of the name, rested on an eleemosynary basis ; at that time it could not be otherwise. Generations needed to be educated by special effort, voluntary effort and State effort, before the people at large could come to understand and value education truly. Not only so, but the merely voluntary educational supply—the supply of schools and of teachers—was essentially faulty, was worse than defective ; it was often evil as well as feeble, and it seemed to be incapable of developing, under any ordinary law of supply and demand, into anything really good. Under these circumstances the Government was compelled to interpose. The necessity of the case had already produced a large basis of eleemosynary supply, which, bad as things

might be, had prevented them from being infinitely worse, had prevented the lower strata of society from sinking deeper still into ignorance and degradation. On this basis Government was obliged to build; at the same time correcting, extending, and completing, as best it could. Some day, let us hope, all classes will have learnt to understand what real education is, and to value it duly; there will be an ample supply of trained teachers to hand down the science of the profession, and to carry forward its improvement; an educated people will be prepared to give the just price (it is always cheap) for a good useful education. When this is the case, and in proportion as this is coming generally to be the case, the price of popular education to parents may gradually rise, and yet the extent of it not be diminished. Working men will learn to pay without grudging threefold what they now pay for the education of their children; it will still be very cheap, hardly more than the price of two quarts of beer or of two ounces of tobacco for a week's schooling, and far less than small tradespeople, with smaller means than the skilled artisan and his family, have been accustomed to give for education of a far inferior quality for their children. When this lesson has been learnt, public aid and bounties for schools and teachers may come to an end. While it is being gradually learnt, the amount of aid may be gradually diminished. This is the course which will, I hope, be pursued in the future. We pour water into the pump-well, when it seems to be dry, until the water flows, and then it rises of itself and follows the stroke of the pump. So in this case, the State has made a special provision to meet a temporary necessity.

Presently the pressure of the necessity will have been met, and the temporary expedient may cease.

It is many years since, in reference to this very subject, I wrote the following words : "In order to put a nation or a class into the way of self-development, it is the duty of the State to take the initiative, whether in the material or in the mental and moral sphere. But after they have fairly and intelligently entered on the path of self-development, Government will do wisely to allow them, both individually and collectively, to work out their own onward way with as little interference as possible. The business of Government will then be rather to follow than to attempt to control ; watching, that it may learn from, the unfolding instincts and tendencies of the class or the nation.

"Hitherto, what are called the masses of this nation have not been put in a way, collectively, of self-development. When they have, Government will have little to do but to leave them alone, or to follow the instincts and demands which successively arise among them, satisfying what in them is true, removing, if possible, the causes from which proceed false and evil elements of opinion and desire. Perhaps, when the nation has attained to its full intellectual and moral majority, it may be found that there is no longer any need for any State endowment or aid in the matter of education. Perhaps, alike in the material, the educational, and the ecclesiastical departments of the national life, perfect voluntary action may then rule, without any need either of prompting or of control. But as yet we are far from that day."*

* *London Quarterly Review*, 1859. Also "Essays for the Times" ("Popular Education"), p. 498.

That day is, in respect of national education, visibly nearer, as I cannot but think, than when (fourteen years ago) I wrote the passage I have ventured to quote. Mr. Fawcett argues powerfully, in his volume on "Political Economy," that our national system of parochial relief to the poor ought to be gradually diminished and finally done away. His reasons for coming to this conclusion seem to be demonstrative: on the present system we grow worse in the midst of increasing national wealth, and must, it would seem, continue to grow worse by a cumulative process of deterioration. It may not be evident how the increasing volume and overflow of pauperism is to be absorbed and done away, till poor laws and poor relief as a national system and institution are brought to an end; but it is abundantly clear that this, and not mere regulation and administrative rectification, is the problem to be studied, the object to be aimed at. But if this be the real truth as respects the comprehensive problem of national pauperism, it must be abundantly evident that a system of vast and national education relief cannot be allowed to continue for an indefinite period. To depauperise the nation educationally will be a comparatively easy and simple thing, and will to some extent prepare the way for the vast task of national depauperisation which Mr. Fawcett contemplates. On the other hand, a system of State-provided, or even State-aided, popular education infects the working principles and accepted ideas of national administration with a sort of taint of organized pauperism.

Whilst, however, it must be admitted that the arguments which forbid a permanent provision by the

State of free education for the whole population, would be equally conclusive against a permanent system of national State-aided education, it will, I hope, appear from what has now been said, that a temporary provision of State-aided national education, in order to rouse the whole people to intelligence and action and a true sense of responsibility on the subject of education, does not lie open to the same objections. Besides which, it must not be forgotten that, so long as the system is only State-aided, not State-provided, and so long as the parent is obliged to find part of the cost of his child's education, the principle of parental responsibility is recognised. Such a State-aided system, indeed, carries within itself the presumption of its own merely temporary and exceptional character. The fact that the parent is called upon to pay the balance of cost for his child's education implies that he may justly, so far as he is able, be required to pay all that is needed for such education. This principle being thus maintained, nothing more is required than its gradual development as the value of education comes to be better understood, and the means of a truly good and sound education are brought universally within reach of families, at a reasonably cheap rate, in order to reduce by degrees the proportion of State-aid to the just and proper measure of relief in cases of real necessity.

It is as certain that, in a Christian country, every family is bound to be "found in" at least elementary education, as that it is bound to be supplied with bread, so far as in either case it is unable to provide itself with what must be regarded as a primary and fundamental "necessary of life." But in the one case, as in the other, the public contribution of aid ought to

be limited to the minimum necessary to secure the requisite provision. All the people must grow up educated with a sound and sufficient education, to start them well and fairly in life as citizens of a free, civilised, historic, and Christian country; the parents ought to be called upon to pay as large a contribution towards the cost of such an education for their children as they can afford to pay; the public revenue, whether imperial or local, must needs find the balance, must, in short, contribute whatever proportion of the cost is found to be absolutely needful in order to secure that education of the future citizen, which, before all things, is of the highest necessity, and to secure which, at whatever necessary outlay, must always be the best and truest economy for a nation. Such, I venture to think, are the principles upon which Parliament and local School Boards equally should endeavour to organize and regulate our English system of national education—at present State-aided, to a somewhat alarming extent, but which, it may be hoped, will become presently and by degrees less dependent on public aid, and in the end self-supporting.

The case of permanent endowments for education I have not considered. They do not really enter into the question which has been under review. The question of their true utilisation has been specifically dealt with by our political economists and by Sir James Shuttleworth, in harmony with the principles indicated in this chapter. They afford the means of extending the foundations of education, in various directions, under legitimate public supervision, of aiding cases at once of special need and special merit, of providing peculiar means and aids for culture and

investigation as to subjects of scientific interest and value, of national concern, and of universal human importance; but they are not implicated with the question of parental responsibility or of general elementary education.

CHAPTER VI.

PRIMARY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

EVERYTHING Irish is misunderstood. For several years past few matters have been so much misrepresented and so little understood as the question of Irish Education. Unfortunately it has been the interest alike of the Ultramontane party in Ireland and of the Ultra-Secularist party in this country that it should be misrepresented and misunderstood, and that England generally should misunderstand it in the same manner. Antagonistic on other points, these parties have agreed in misleading English public opinion as to the actual character of the Irish national system as it now is, and also as to the character of the demands which the Ultramontanes are making for its subversion. Both assert or imply that the existing Irish system is a secular and non-religious system, and that what the Ultramontanes demand is to have it changed into a denominational system similar to that which has grown up in England. These propositions are both of them flagrantly untrue.

From the very first, that is, ever since it was initiated in 1831, the Irish National System has been religious in its general basis and character, with

special provision for the separate teaching of dogmatic forms of faith by the clergy of the different denominations to the children of their respective flocks. Secularism has never been an element in the Irish system, has never been desired and would never have been tolerated in Ireland, where all classes and all professions may be said to be saturated with religious convictions.

For thirty years past the denominational system has been established in Ireland. The Non-Vested National Schools of Ireland are avowedly denominational, more strictly so, on the whole, than the denominational schools of England. At the present time nearly three-fourths of the Irish National Schools are non-vested or denominational.

Until the way was opened for the reception into the National System of the denominational schools, the National System made slow progress in Ireland. It was opposed from the first by the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians, and the Wesleyans, precisely because of its "unsectarian" character and the broad indifference (speaking as respects dogmatic and ecclesiastical distinctions) of its platform. It was looked on favourably at first by the Roman Catholics, Archbishop Murray co-operating with Archbishop Whately for many years on its Board. The Presbyterians in 1840 won such extensive and essential concessions to the denominational principle that, after that period, the various Protestant denominations united their schools very extensively to the Board, whilst still, for a dozen years longer, the Roman Catholic denomination continued to support it.

About twenty years after the foundation of the system, Provincial Model Schools began to be esta-

blished. Before this the only Model School had been at Dublin. These schools were intended not only as models, but as training schools from which pupil-teachers might be sent up to be regularly trained for their profession at Dublin in the College of the Board. They were established with the warm approval of Roman Catholic authorities, although for some years past they have been the continual subject of Ultramontane denunciation. They provide for teachers of different religious persuasions in the same school, each of whom is bound religiously to instruct the children of his own persuasion, and for the attendance weekly at the schools of the clergy of the different Churches, each to examine and supplement what the teachers have been doing, and to keep up the pastoral charge of the children of his own flock. These schools have never yet numbered thirty, and can never be regarded as characterizing the system, which, as I have said, is predominantly denominational. But they do represent what the Board, at least in its better days, would have desired all the schools of Ireland, as far as possible, to resemble. In their common teaching they are unsectarian and religious; in their special arrangements and instruction they are omni-sectarian and dogmatic. As these schools have been built and are maintained out of the revenue of the country, it is hard to see how they are to be cleared from the reproach of what is spoken of as "concurrent endowment." They are admirable schools, and it is no wonder if the Ultramontane party covet the possession of them as their own, without any embarrassment of a conscience clause; no wonder if they are resolved to do all in their power to wring from the weakness of English

Ministries the concession of these schools to themselves, as the seminaries of an unmitigated Romish "denominationalism."

Secularism, as I have said, is utterly abhorrent to the Irish mind; the Birmingham prescriptions would merely drive Ireland frantic: but Mr. Forster, if he adheres to the principles of his own Act, is bound, not only to reject altogether the claims of Cardinal Cullen, but to reform the existing denominational schools of Ireland in such a sense as, while it leaves their immediate management and working still with the respective Churches, shall make the schools much more truly answer to their designation as National, by reducing their denominationalism to a minimum, and bringing them fully under national regulations.

These general propositions in regard to the Irish school system will be established and illustrated in the condensed sketch I am about to give of the history of that system.

The people of "the land of saints" seem always to have had a great thirst for learning, whenever the way to attain it has been in any degree opened. This is a truth which might, I dare say, be illustrated by a reference to all ages of Irish history, from the days anterior to the Norman Conquest, when the island was a home and refuge for learning on the farthest verge of Europe,—then, as a continent, immersed in thick darkness—through the rare interludes of comparative peace and rallying elasticity, which are found in its sad and dismal records, both during the times preceding, and during the different stages and phases of its history which have followed, the English Reformation. Notwithstanding its poverty, its misfortunes, and its Popery, the Irish nation, at

the beginning of the present century, seems, as a people, to have valued education and learning more highly than the English ; and if, on the average, the information of the people of Ireland was, perhaps, more scanty and less exact than that of the English people, their intelligence appears to have been decidedly quicker, and their national esteem of the schoolmaster and his vocation decidedly higher. To be "learned," indeed, has always been a high and great thing in the esteem of the Irish : the relative value of learning, in comparison especially with wealth or material prosperity, has been rated higher than in this country.

At the beginning of this century, there were a considerable number of educational endowments, of which, however, the Protestant proportion was, in comparison of the number of Protestants in the island, immensely richer than the Roman Catholic. All the Royal and Parliamentary endowments went on the old Establishment principle ; they were Protestant endowments for Protestant, mostly for Episcopalian, education ; and they were created on the principle, which for so long a period was in the ascendant, that the Roman Catholic religion must either be treated as a proscribed religion, or must at least be ignored. As a matter of course, schools founded by private bequest were of an exclusive character. The most important class of exclusive Protestant schools were the schools founded under the indenture and assignment of Erasmus Smith, a citizen of London, who had obtained a grant of estates sequestrated on account of the Irish Rebellion of 1641. In his own words, under date 1682, his end in founding the schools was "to propagate the

Protestant faith according to the Scriptures, avoiding all superstition." The estates for supporting these schools are very large, comprising upwards of 13,000 acres in Limerick and Tipperary, in Galway, Westmeath, Sligo, and King's County, and the income is £9,000 a year. The schools are strongly Protestant and Episcopalian. The Protestant "Charter Schools," or Schools of the Incorporated Society, hold endowments founded by Royal and private bequests, and were formerly very largely sustained—to the gross amount of more than a million of money—out of Parliamentary grants. These schools were expressly founded for "the conversion and civilisation" of the "Popish natives, who are kept by their clergy in gross ignorance, and bred up in great disaffection to the Government." They have an income from real property and estates to the amount of £8,000 a year. There are, besides, schools aided by the wealthy endowments of the Irish Society, of which the managing centre is a committee of the Corporation of the City of London; while the Irish sub-centre is Londonderry. These endowments, like those to which we have already particularly referred, were intended to promote Protestant education, and the establishment of the Protestant religion. The private bequests of Roman Catholics for Roman Catholic education were comparatively very small in amount; it may be doubted whether they exceeded in value the private endowments and bequests of Protestants for Protestant education, apart from those great estates of which we have spoken.

The first movement in the direction of providing a broad and equitable system of National Education for Ireland seems to have been initiated by the "Four-

teenth Report of the Commissioners on Schools of Public or Charitable Foundation in Ireland," published in 1812. It is much to their credit that three prelates of the Church of Ireland head the list of signatures to this Commission—William Armagh, Charles Cashel, and James Killala. I may note also, in passing, the name, as another of the Commissioners —a name once much better known than now—of Richard Lovell Edgeworth, the father of the distinguished authoress, Miss Edgeworth, both the father and the daughter being eminent educationists. The Commissioners state that "the people of Ireland are extremely anxious to obtain instruction for their children, even at an expense which, though small, very many of them can ill afford;" they state further that, in the number of existing schools, there was little or no deficiency, so that, if the teachers, the school-books, and the school-rooms, had been what they ought, "the lower orders of this country would have less reason, perhaps, to complain of their education being neglected than those of England or even of Scotland itself;" but they condemn the great majority of the teachers as altogether incompetent, and not seldom worse than incompetent; the school-books as miserably unsuitable, and too often pernicious; and the school-rooms as often altogether wretched; and they recommend that a system of schools be established on Catholic and equitable principles, schools which should be Christian but not sectarian. Such a system, they anticipated, would be "cordially accepted" by the people, provided that "all interference with the particular religious tenets" of the children should, "in the first instance, be unequivocally disclaimed,

and effectually guarded against." They speak of the schools which they desired to see established, as schools which should invite "a careful attention to moral and religious principles with an evident purpose of respecting the peculiar tenets of different sects of Christians." In reference to the selection of books for the proposed schools, they say: "We doubt not but it will be found practicable to introduce not only a number of books in which moral principles will be inculcated" in a suitable manner, "but also ample extracts from the Sacred Scriptures themselves," by means of a "selection, in which the most important parts of Sacred History shall be included, together with all the precepts of morality, and all the instructive examples by which those precepts are illustrated and enforced;" and they add that such a selection would not "be liable to any of the objections which have been made to the use of the Scriptures in the course of education." It is impossible to read this Report of 1812 without acknowledging the candour and liberality of the men who prepared it—a candour and liberality in striking contrast with the prevailing tone of Irish feeling on religious questions, whether on one side or the other, especially during the last five-and-forty-years; and without also recognising in the sketch which they give of the system needed for Ireland the general features of the Irish National System, as originally set forth in Mr. Stanley's (the late Lord Derby's) Letter to the Duke of Leinster in 1831. The Commissioners of 1812, however,—wiser in this, I venture to think, than Mr. Stanley, or the statesmen and Irish educationists of his day—made no proposal to provide special and clerical religious instruction for the various denominations

in the schools which they proposed to establish. They would have founded a system, not indeed secular —the reverse of this—but unsectarian ; and they would have left schoolmasters to teach the scholars on this unsectarian basis, apart from all special forms or peculiar doctrines.

The Government, however, of which Lord Liverpool was the Chief Minister, and which was represented in Ireland by the Duke of Richmond, as Lord Lieutenant, did not see their way to the foundation, or the separate initiation, of a new system of schools established on the principle defined in the Report of 1812. They determined to work by means of a private society. The Kildare Street Society was a liberal Christian Association, not expressly Protestant, and including some Roman Catholics among its supporters, which was founded on the principle of establishing or aiding schools in which the Holy Scriptures should be read without note or comment, but no denominational tests enforced or forms permitted to be used. Through this Society the Government decided to distribute its Parliamentary aid, rather than establish a new system of national character and dimensions. The result, however, was far from satisfactory, especially as, in consequence of the Catholic Relief controversy, religious animosities and prejudices began to grow more and more embittered. "The determination," says Mr. Stanley, in his famous Letter, "to enforce in all the schools the reading of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment was undoubtedly taken with the purest motives ; with the wish at once to connect literary with moral and religious education, and, at the same time, not to run the risk of wounding the peculiar feelings of any

sect by catechetical instruction or tenets, which might tend to subjects of polemical controversy. But it seems to have been overlooked that the principles of the Roman Catholic Church were totally at variance with this principle; and that the *indiscriminate* reading of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment, by children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a Church which denies, even to adults, the right of unaided private interpretation of the Sacred Volume with respect to articles of religious belief."

The opposition of the Romish clergy was too powerful for the system of which I am speaking to be maintained. In 1824-5, accordingly, the Commissioners of Education for Ireland recommended a system according to which "two teachers" (again to quote the late Lord Derby's Letter of 1831) should be appointed in every school, "one Protestant and the other Catholic, to superintend separately the religious education of the children; and they hoped to have been able to agree upon a selection from the Scriptures which might have been generally acquiesced in by both persuasions. But it was soon found that these schemes were impracticable; and, in 1828, a Committee of the House of Commons recommended a system to be adopted which should afford, if possible, a combined literary and a separate religious education." It was in consequence of this recommendation that the present Irish National System of education was initiated, in 1831, by the issuing of the Letter to the Duke of Leinster, then Lord Lieutenant, from which I have been quoting, the authorship of which was one of the most famous and fruitful acts in the public life of the late Earl of Derby (then Mr. Stanley), who in 1831, was the Secretary for Ireland,

in connection with the Whig Government of Earl Grey.

The leading principle of the Irish system was shadowed forth in the words quoted by Mr. Stanley, and which I have quoted, from the recommendations of the Committee of the House of Commons in 1828; the words are—'a combined literary and a separate religious education.' If, however, the word *literary* had been understood to mean *secular*, as that word is employed in the educational controversies of the present time, it would have been found to be impossible to construct any system of education for Ireland on such a basis. Nowadays—in the *Daily News*, and by the preachers and agitators of the Birmingham League platform—the principle of the Irish National System is continually spoken of as that of 'united *secular* and separate religious instruction.' There could scarcely be a more pointed misrepresentation. The first draught of Mr. Stanley's letter spoke of 'combined literary and separate religious instruction.' But he found it necessary, on consideration, to alter his phraseology and to speak of 'combined literary and moral instruction.' And when the Board of National Education was appealed to in regard to the meaning to be attached to the word *moral*, they found that the moralities of instruction could not be separated from religious convictions and principles; and so 'combined literary and moral' was officially interpreted to signify combined 'literary, moral, and religious' instruction.

The truth as to this point is well set forth by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, a distinguished Presbyterian minister, of Belfast, in his "Plea for the United Education of the Youth of Ireland in National Schools"—

a witness all the more unimpeachable for my present purpose, because he is at the same time a supporter of the general principles of the Irish National System, and also a professed opponent of what he describes as denominational education.

"The excellent principle," he says, "adopted by Mr. Stanley from the Commission of 1828, that of 'a combined literary and separate religious education,' was no sooner enunciated than it was departed from. Before the Letter of Lord Derby (Mr. Stanley) was formally expedited, a draught copy of it was submitted to the Duke of Leinster and the other gentlemen who were to be, and who afterwards were, named as Commissioners; and, by their advice, a very important alteration was made in its terms. By the advice of the Commissioners elect, Lord Derby was prevailed upon to introduce the words 'moral and literary,' instead of 'literary' alone, before the word 'education;' the change was made with the avowed intention of intermixing a considerable amount of religious teaching with the instruction given during the time set apart for united education; and, accordingly, not only were the ordinary lesson-books, prepared by the Commission, largely impregnated with religious teaching, but four volumes of extracts from the Bible were drawn up — together with one of religious poetry, containing some things of a very sectarian character—and a little work on the Evidences of Christianity, *all of which are decidedly religious, if they are anything; yet all of which are recommended by the Board for use in the National Schools during the hours allotted to united instruction.*"

So also, in the "Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry" (1870), the following passage, among many

to a similar purpose, occurs: "In preparing the Board's reading-books of combined instruction, Mr. Carlile introduced a very considerable portion of religious instruction. So far, indeed, is the association of religious with literary instruction carried, that Mr. Cross, when secretary, declared: 'There is really, strictly speaking, nothing that can be called exclusively secular instruction in a National School in which the books of the Board are read. It cannot be called a system of purely secular instruction; for the books are penetrated, every page of them, with religious knowledge and religious sentiment. So that there really is a combination, during the ordinary school hours, of literary and religious education, though it is not peculiar to any one religious denomination.' 'From the first book to the last,' says Mr. M'Donnell, now Resident Commissioner, 'there is, in proportion as the understanding of the child develops, always something of religious food prepared for it in each of the books.'"*

In fact, as Mr. Holmes, another Commissioner, affirms, it was a "fundamental principle of the system that, so far as it could be accomplished, a religious education was to form part of it, subject to objections from any particular class or sect of Christians."

Whilst, however, the Irish National System was intended to provide, and did to a very effective degree provide, a common unsectarian education, literary and religious, for the children of all denominations, it also made express and particular provision for the instruction of the children of the different sects in their own special doctrines and formularies. This was no

* Report, &c., p. 39.

less an essential part of the system than the other. I am not, however, fully persuaded that it was in itself a necessity of legislation or of administration. That forty years ago Ireland would not have endured a secular system of schools, we can have no doubt. Such an idea as that of a merely secular education, could find no entertainment among such a people. Purely secular schools would have been regarded as altogether irreligious, as no better than infidel schools. Schools in which no religious reference, no appeal to the authority of God, or to the religious sanctions of conscience, no recognition of the duty of worship or of the character and office of the clergyman, could be allowed, in which all religious feeling and consciousness, all play or acknowledgment of religious life, was to be by law suppressed, would never have been tolerated by the Irish people. But schools from which the official presence, the authority and instructions, of the clergy were to be excluded, might, perhaps, have been accepted by the people, though probably not without much dissatisfaction in many quarters; at all events the Kildare Street Society's schools, which were numerous, appear to have been carried on apart from clerical visitation and indoctrination. Such a thought, however, as a national system of schools for any division of this kingdom, from all share in the administration of which the clergy were to be excluded, was not likely to be entertained by any British statesman forty years ago. That the clergy should have their prominent and recognised place in any educational system was deemed proper in itself, according to the decorous ideas which then prevailed: it also appeared to be necessary, in order to secure the co-operation of the clergy with

the Government in working the new measure, especially the Catholic clergy. It is not unlikely, indeed, so far as the clergy of the Protestant Establishment were concerned, that the recognition of the clergy of other denominations as, equally with themselves, entitled to be recognised in a national system of education, may have operated to prejudice them against the proposed measure. It is certain that the extent to which the Roman Catholics were recognised in the Whig scheme, set the Protestants of the country generally against it, whether Churchmen, or Presbyterians, or Methodists. But, on the other hand, although the mixture of children in the schools, and the admission, in any form, of a community of Christianity between themselves and Protestants, was undoubtedly, from the first, no less an offence to the necessarily intolerant spirit of Romanism than the recognition of the Roman Catholic clergy was to the clergy of the Irish Establishment, yet the recognition by Government and Parliament of a sect just emerging from all manner of civil and religious disabilities was a great recommendation of the measure in the eyes of the moderate, and equally of the wily and politic Romanists. On the whole, it seemed greatly to improve the national position of the Roman Catholic Church. It could not, also, but be foreseen, from the first, that, practically, a large proportion of whatever schools might be set up must be thoroughly Roman Catholic, either wholly, or almost wholly, unmixed with any Protestant element, and that, by virtue of the provision for special religious instruction by the clergy, they must come, not only under the potent indirect, but under the full and immediate, religious direction and influence of the priest.

Accordingly, while Irish Protestants in general regarded the new measure with bitter antagonism, a feeling which very many earnest Christians in England shared, it was welcomed by many Roman Catholics; and Roman Catholic landowners and priests prepared themselves to use and work it to their utmost advantage. Now, Cardinal Cullen and his party are bold enough to demand, and strong enough to exercise great political pressure in support of their demand, that the system of 1831 may be displaced for one which shall give complete ascendancy, at the sole cost of the State, to the Roman Catholic priesthood over the education, in every grade, of all the Roman Catholics in Ireland; now they denounce as an infidel compromise Lord Derby's great measure; but, in 1831, Archbishop Murray and his clergy accepted the same measure as a great boon. The tables, in fact, are completely turned. In the interest of Protestant ascendancy (not without some reason, as the result has proved) the Irish National System was denounced, forty years ago, as a latitudinarian and unbelieving compromise, which would undermine the position of Protestantism, while it would at the same time strengthen and endow Popery, and also, in some of its tendencies and results, foster religious indifference or unbelief. Now, the Roman Catholic party in Ireland, in the interest of Popish ascendancy, make parallel charges against the same system; they affirm that it prevents the true and rightful ascendancy of the Church in the training of the people, and that it tends to religious indifference and unbelief.

The arrangement for special religious instruction in the schools provided that, before or after the

ordinary school hours, the clergy or their approved substitutes might instruct the children of their respective congregations in their peculiar tenets, and, in fact, hold a religious service with them. The authorised substitutes of the clergy were the schoolmasters of the same denomination; and so the system came to be that immediately before or after the ordinary hours the school-teacher instructed the children of his own faith in religious knowledge, following the directions in so doing of his clergyman, and that once a week the clergyman attended himself to examine, and test, and hear repetitions, and supplement in every way the work of the teacher.

The following were the original rules of the Irish Board in regard to religious instruction :—

"1. The ordinary school business, during which all the children, of whatever denomination they be, are required to attend, and which is expected to embrace a competent number of hours in each day, is to consist exclusively of instruction in those branches of knowledge which belong to literary and moral education. Such extracts from the Scriptures as are prepared under the sanction of the Board may be used, and are earnestly recommended by the Board to be used, during those hours allotted to this ordinary school business.

"2. One day in each week (independently of Sunday) is to be set apart for religious instruction of the children, on which day such pastors or other persons as are approved by the parents or guardians of the children shall have access to them for that purpose.

"3. The managers of schools are also expected, should the parents of any of the children desire it, to afford convenient opportunity and facility for the

same purpose, either before or after the ordinary school business (as the managers may determine) on the other days of the week."*

From which it will be seen that, besides the instruction before or after school daily by the school teacher, one whole day in a week was set apart for the children to receive religious instruction from their own pastors.

Where the children are largely mixed in any school, it has been the principle of the Board that, if possible, two teachers of different religious persuasions should be provided, a chief and an under-teacher, so that each of these might take the children of his own denomination daily for religious instruction. This has been most fully carried out in some of the Model Schools, where, I believe, there have sometimes been three teachers of different religious denominations to correspond to the different denominations of the children. From which it is evident, that when the National Schools of Ireland, built and maintained out of the Consolidated Fund, are not sectarian, it is only because they are multi-sectarian, or, as far as possible, omni-sectarian.

I have given above the original rules of the Irish Board in reference to religious instruction. When the system was about ten years old, however, these rules were modified, so modified that, on the one hand, religious instruction may, on certain conditions, be given at any time during the *ordinary* school hours, while, on the other hand, the requirement to set apart for religious instruction by the clergy of the denominations one separate day a week has been dispensed with.

* "Reports of the Commissioners," &c. vol. i. p. 10.

We find this alteration fully defined in the "Rules and Regulations" of the Board, as published in 1842.

"The patrons of the several schools have the right of appointing such religious instruction as they may think proper to be given therein, provided that each school be opened to children of all communions; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that, accordingly, no child be compelled to receive, or be present at, any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object; and that the time for giving it be so fixed, that no child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords: *subject to this, religious instruction may be given, either during the fixed school hours or otherwise.*"*

So that, if the patrons or managers so please, religious instruction may be given in an Irish National School at eleven in the morning or three in the afternoon, and this has been the rule for thirty years. The rule of 1842, which I have quoted, was one of the concessions agreed upon in 1840-1, to meet the demands of the Presbyterians, who desired to put their denominational schools under the Board. The Roman Catholics have always insisted that this rule ought either to be cancelled, or an entire and thorough denominational system granted. They now insist on the latter alternative. I trust the other will be taken.

In the later editions of the "Rules and Regulations" the liberty to give religious instruction at an intermediate hour in Irish National Schools is thus particularly defined and guarded:—

"Religious instruction, prayer, or other religious

* Reports, &c., vol. i. p. 109.

exercises, may take place, at any time, before and after the ordinary school business (during which all children, of whatever denomination they be, are required to attend), *but must not take place at more than one intermediate time*, between the commencement and the close of the ordinary school business."

There is also an "earnest recommendation" (the Commissioners have not ventured to make a *Regulation*) that, "*whenever the patron or manager thinks fit* to have religious instruction at an intermediate time, a separate apartment shall (when practicable) be provided for the reception of those children who, according to these rules, should not be present thereat." The *rule* is that they should not be present; the *recommendation* is that they shall have a room found for them. Suppose "the patron or manager" should not "think fit" to provide such a room, are the children to go out of the school into the air?

The words I have put in italics in the last quotation show where the power rests in these schools. There is no local or managing committee, except in very rare cases, in Irish National Schools; it is not required that there should be one. The all but universal system is for the clergyman or priest to be patron; and he is absolute master.

It will be evident, from what I have now written, whence the Birmingham League and the Nonconformist Conference at Manchester have derived their ideas as to a new National System for England. They would have the Irish system in its general outline, as originally intended, with this most grave and fundamental difference, that the teacher shall teach absolutely nothing but what is secular. Substitute

for an unsectarian Christian education, literary and religious, a purely secular education, and forbid the teacher to teach religion in the schoolroom at any time whatever, even though it were before or after hours; the Irish system will then be transformed into the system proposed to-day by such men as Mr. Dale, of Birmingham, and the party with which he has identified himself. They take from the Irish system its worst feature, that which has made it a means of promoting clerical exclusiveness and Ultramontane bigotry, that which stamps it with the character of concurrent endowment, and they propose to put this as a framework round a school routine of hard and bare secular instruction. They would do what even in Ireland, where lay Christian rights are less understood than in England, and all denominations are too much under the domination of clerical ideas and influence, it had not been attempted to do, —silence the lay teacher altogether, and make the clergy the sole instructors of children in Christian principles and doctrine. They may be congratulated on having proposed the most plausible and attractive concordat which it would have been possible for cultivated infidelity to offer to exclusive clerical pretensions. Archdeacon Denison has at last found an effectual ally in Mr. Dale. Rationalists and Anglo-Catholics may not improbably agree on this basis. Unbelief, High-Churchmanship, and the concurrent endowment so dear to the mere politician, may here combine.

Let it be observed, however, that the Irish scheme was in one important respect adapted at this point to the conditions of Ireland and to Irish ideas, whilst, in the same respect, the English copy is opposed to the

conditions of England and to English ideas. In Ireland the number of religious denominations is much smaller than England; frequently there is not more than one; only in larger towns are there more than two or three of the least consideration; and there are not many towns in Ireland of any considerable magnitude. Besides which the number of ministers of all denominations in Ireland, in proportion to the population, is much larger than in England, and furthermore, there are very few families in Ireland without any sense whatever of religion. The Protestant population is a population possessing real Protestant religious convictions; the Roman Catholic population are loyal to their Church and its priests. Whereas in England there is a large proportion of children belonging to families which own no minister and no relation to any Christian congregation; for these, so sadly in need of Christian nurture, of the "bread of life," the League of Birmingham and the Nonconformists at Manchester would provide only the secular "stone," hard, bare, chilling, God-ignoring, merely secular, instruction. There are, on the other hand, multitudes of village Methodists in "circuits" where there is one "head" place, town or larger village, with its resident ministers, and a dozen or even twenty, sometimes thirty, villages on the circuit plan, in each of which there is a parish church and a clergyman. The Birmingham plan would, in effect, hand over all these children to the religious instruction of the parish clergyman, instead of allowing the lay teacher, whether of the National, the British, or the Methodist school, to give them plain instruction out of the Bible. The teacher could have given them an interesting and effective Bible lesson; the clergy-

man would require them to learn off the Church catechism, and prepare them for confirmation.

It is perfectly idle to suppose that Methodist local preachers or class leaders, as approved substitutes for the Methodist ministers, could be found to give regular instruction to these children. If they were competent, they would not have time. The village pastor of the Baptist congregation, indeed, might sometimes be able to look after the children of his flock, if he has not some lay business to prevent him from so doing. But, on the whole, if the Birmingham Anti-State-Church educational agitators had entered into a "League" to further, instead of to oppose, clerical influence, they could hardly have played more completely into the hands of High Churchmen. They make the Christian instruction of children to be in effect a perquisite of priests and pastors—"a clergy reserve." They propose, besides, in effect, to endow the Church of England and village Dissenters with buildings, to be built and kept up for them at the public expense, in which they may teach their respective doctrines, however sectarian, to the rising generation, and hold "children's services." The whole scheme of the ill-assorted party, in which religious voluntaries of high professions and free-thinking doctrinaires are strangely combined, is itself an ill-omened and inharmonious combination of secularism in school hours, with clerical exclusiveness and concurrent endowment.

The Irish system could not be accused of any such fault and folly as that of silencing the teacher as an instructor in religion; its founders knew that the school teacher, as a rule, would be by far the most efficient instructor in religion. But they placed him absolutely under the direction and control of the

priest-patron, or the minister-patron, as the case might be.* One good point, however, is, that the use of sectarian emblems in the schoolrooms is prohibited.

We have seen that the principle of the Irish system is an impartially *omni*-sectarian principle. Where, in any place, however, there is practically but one denomination, of course the *omni*-sectarian school becomes a simple sectarian or denominational school. From the beginning, this was the case in regard to a large proportion of the Irish National Schools. Except where the dissentient minority was considerable, the only religious instruction given in the school was, as a rule, that given by the teacher, under the authority of the patron, to the children of his own religious persuasion. In the vested schools the right of all ministers to instruct the children of their own flocks existed on paper, but was, for the most part, dormant.

It is provided in the "Rules and Regulations" that the school houses, built with the money of the State, may, under the direction of the "patron or manager," be used as Sunday-schools, and even, occasionally, for divine worship. As a matter of fact, the great majority of the State-built Irish schools are used by the Roman Catholic Church as Sunday-schools, the rest being so used by other denominations.

Virtually, therefore, from the first, the Irish National System was, to a considerable extent, a denominational system; and it could not but tend to become so more and more. The chief, almost the only, safeguard against abuse in this direction was the Time-table Conscience Clause, which mutual

* The priest-patron also, in these Irish National Schools, whether vested or non-vested, has been, as the O'Keefe case shows, under the absolute dominion of the Bishop, who has had the power of deposing him at will.

ecclesiastical and religious animosity greatly serves to enforce, and for the effectiveness of which, accordingly, in Ireland, there have been stronger guarantees than, perhaps, we can expect to have, in England, for our similar conscience clause, notwithstanding the efforts of the League. In this country we must trust more to the English sense of honour and fair-play, in which, we will hope, English gentlemen, even although they may have "taken orders," will not be found wanting.

Thus far I have dealt with the Irish system in general, without taking account of the distinction between the schools called "Vested" and those called "Non-Vested." One cannot but admire the original conception—broad, generous, and statesmanlike—which governed the moulding of the plan set forth by Mr. Stanley (Lord Derby). It has been fruitful and operative in the provincial legislation of some of the dependencies of Great Britain, and has undoubtedly, to some extent, been realised in the actual working of the Irish system. The idea which inspired the scheme was precisely the same as the Whig Government would have embodied in a National measure for England, according to the abortive, but finely conceived, proposals which they put forth in 1839, and which provoked such a tempest of opposition in this country. But, by force of circumstances, the original conception, as set forth in 1831, has proved to be, as a whole, impracticable. The diverse elements of Irish ecclesiastical and religious life could not be held in neutral solution within the schoolroom; the process of crystallization would proceed; it has, in fact, taken place; and, instead of a common unsectarian system, we have an aggregate

of schools under denominational influence and management, which, to some effective extent, yet with many lamentable failures and drawbacks, are nationalised for educational purposes.

The experience of the first eight years after the initiation of the National School System seemed to show that the system was not likely speedily, if ever, to become truly national. The Protestant denominations generally were arrayed against it. It would not be possible to say whether the Episcopalians of the Established Church, or the Presbyterians of Ulster, were more opposed to it. It was not by any means unanimously supported by the Roman Catholic clergy. Up to the year 1839, the number of National Schools did not reach 1,400. In 1839 the Irish Board found a way to admit denominational schools, as such, into union with the Board; and from that time the number of schools rapidly increased, until now it is nearly 7,000. The Board secured the success of the system—by the abandonment of its original principle. Both these results were effected by the capitulation of the Board, in 1839, to the Ulster Presbyterians, from which date definite recognition has been given to the class of Non-Vested schools—a class of denominational schools, which, in a fuller and stricter sense than English National or Wesleyan schools, are denominational, and which, notwithstanding, are called National, and are, in many cases, wholly—in all cases, almost wholly—maintained out of the national revenue.

At the end of 1871 (the last return) there were 6,914 schools called National in Ireland. At the same date there were in all Ireland of schools called Vested, and which, though managed by denomina-

tional patrons, are national property, having being built by public money, 2,000 separate departments, held and taught in 1,314 school-houses. All the rest of the 6,914 schools—viz., 4,914—are what are called Non-Vested schools, that is to say, schools which are the property of different denominations, or (in a few instances) personal and private property. Among these Non-Vested schools are convent schools not a few, and also monastic schools. The Model Schools (doubtless the best schools in Ireland) are only 27 in number. During the year 1871 there were 185 schools added to the list of National Schools; of these one was under the Poor Law Guardians, 183 were Non-Vested and denominational, and the remaining one was under the joint management of a Disestablished Church and of a Roman Catholic clergyman. Not one was a Vested school.

The Non-Vested schools, as I have stated, were admitted into the system of National Schools in consequence of concessions made by the Board in 1839. From the beginning, however, the germ of that which has become so dominant a development was found in the system. From the beginning convent schools and the schools of the Christian Brethren were admitted into the system and to its benefits, although the buildings remained the property of the Roman Catholic Church. This was only allowed however, under certain *nominal* restrictions. The clergy of other denominations were to have access to these schools, if they thought good, at certain hours; and, except at fixed hours, it was agreed that religious instruction should not be given. But no Protestant clergyman would ever trouble the inside of a convent or of a fraternity school; very few Protestant children

would be found inside such schools; and we may be absolutely certain that all restrictive conditions as to such schools would from the beginning be little more than a dead letter.

It was, however, to the sectarian tenacity and pertinacity of the Ulster Presbyterians that the full and avowed development of the system of Non-Vested schools was due. When they saw National Schools in purely Romanist districts working under the sole management of priest-patrons, they could not but know that, whatever they might profess to be, they must really be thoroughly Romanist schools; when they found Roman convent and fraternity schools, as was the case from the first, recognised as if they were proper Board Schools in the fullest sense, no wonder that they were resolved to leave no stone unturned to secure similar help and recognition for their denominational schools as National Schools. The keen Scotch-Irishmen of Ulster had a long fight to secure their point; but they did secure it at last, after years of bargaining, after negotiations had been once before concluded and then broken off. And they secured it most completely. Other denominations have since entered into the fruit of their contentions.

The Presbyterians gained three vital points—(1) That their schools should be adopted by the Board, as Church schools or as Congregational schools, not as general public schools of the town or village, the district or locality; (2) That the ministers of other communions should have no right, as in the case of ordinary National Schools, to enter their schools at any given time, for the purpose of instructing in religion the children of their flock, or at any time for

any special purpose whatever ; (3) That they should not be prevented from reading the Scriptures, or giving specific instruction at any hour, whether first, or last, or intermediate, which should be fixed and made definitely known—although they repudiated all obligation to dismiss or to warn the children of Roman Catholics when the hour of religious instruction should begin. From the year 1839, when they won their victory on these points, it has been a standing, a continually reiterated complaint on the part of the Roman Catholic authorities of Ireland, that throughout Ulster the children of Roman Catholics in Presbyterian schools have been in the habit of receiving in the intermediate school-hours Biblical and religious instruction from Presbyterian teachers in the Non-Vested National Schools which stand in connection with the Synod of Ulster.

The victory of the Presbyterians on behalf of denominational schools brought after it, as a consequence, an important change in the rule of the Board as to religious instruction in all the schools under the Board. The date of the Presbyterian victory was 1839. In 1842, as we have already seen, the right of giving intermediate instruction in religion, besides what might be given before or after the ordinary school hours, was extended to all the schools under the Board, whether Vested or Non-Vested. The only distinction of any importance which now exists between the Vested and Non-Vested schools is, that in the former the ministers of all denominations have a right to give instruction to the children of their flock in the schoolroom at certain fixed periods. We have already seen that, in a large proportion of the Vested schools, this right is merely a right on paper ;

practically it amounts to nothing. Not even in all the Model Schools is it practically operative ; although, if claimed in any of these, it would of course be enforced.

It will be evident, from what has been now shown, how thoroughly denominational in their character and influence are most of the Irish schools, not only the Non-Vested, but many also of the Vested. In *all* the Irish schools, the "unsectarian" schools of Ireland, the catechisms of the respective denominations are taught by the school-teacher—the catechism of the Westminster Confession by the Presbyterian teacher, the Church catechism by the Episcopalian teacher, the Romish catechism by the Roman Catholic teacher. In all, the clergymen of the respective denominations give specific religious instruction themselves ; all the schoolrooms are used as Sunday-schools ; in nearly all, the children are prepared for confirmation by their spiritual pastors ; most are used by the denomination to which the patrons belong on the week-night for denominational purposes as well as on the Sunday. The schools are managed, all alike, by denominational patrons, who, in nearly all cases, are clergymen, who are checked by no committee, but govern absolutely alone, and who can dismiss a teacher (according to a very precise rule of the Irish Board) at their mere option, with or without reason, without reason assigned either to the teacher or any one else. Finally, in all the Irish schools, whether Vested or Non-Vested, religious instruction may be given by patron or by the teacher at any fixed hour during the ordinary school hours, besides the instruction given before or after hours. This last concession

to denominationalism, forced on the Board by the Presbyterians, who had a powerful co-religionist ally, a member of their own Synod, on the Board itself, has been turned to abundant profit in Romish convent and fraternity schools. In our English denominational schools, on the other hand, there is no irresponsible priest-patron, but a responsible local committee, and no religious instruction whatever can be given at any time within the fixed school hours reserved by the Act. In our denominational schools, moreover, the Government cannot pay more than half —cannot well, on an average, pay more than about two-fifths—of the cost of maintaining the school; whereas in Ireland the national revenue contributes sometimes the whole, in most cases nearly the whole, in all cases, I believe, not less than three-fourths, of the cost of maintaining the school.

The Presbyterians having obtained such a complete concession from the Board, it is no wonder that their schools were speedily brought into connection with the Board, and no wonder that other denominations presently followed their example. The whole concession was gained by the denominations, together with the advantages of Government inspection, national maintenance, and national prestige, on the easy condition of accepting the Conscience Clause, and inscribing "National School" on their school-houses. The same designation might, with at least as much justice, be conceded to the existing denominational inspected schools of England—unless, indeed, the fact that the Government pays for schools is sufficient to constitute them "National," whoever may have the management. If so, the way to do away with the denominational character of the

English voluntary inspected schools would be for the Government to relieve the denominations of their cost, while the denominations retain the management.

Before the Board capitulated to the Presbyterians in 1839, and by so doing gave definite recognition to the class of Non-Vested schools, the total number of National Schools was 1,384 ; it is now, as we have seen, 6,914. In 1838 a few convent and fraternity schools were almost all the schools not strictly Vested which were connected with the Board ; now the vast majority are Non-Vested. In short, while the number of Vested schools in the last thirty years has only increased fifty per cent., the present number being, as we have said, 2,000, nearly 5,000 Non-Vested schools have been brought into connection with the Board. I am bound to add that the Presbyterians have made compensation for their zeal in preserving to the utmost extent possible the Protestant, the Presbyterian, the sectarian character of their own schools, by their keen and watchful jealousy to enforce, as far as possible, the non-sectarian principle of control and management in the case of Roman Catholic schools, and especially by their anxiety to prevent the Government from allowing convent schools to carry out fully the principles which they had claimed to act upon in their own Presbyterian schools. If the English principle now embodied in the Education Act were made the rule for Ireland, and strictly secular limitation were imposed on all the teaching during the recognised and ordinary hours, it would be a great relief to Irish agitation, or at least it ought to be.

I do not need to say much about the Model Schools

of Ireland. The first was established in connection with the Training Institution for Teachers in Dublin, and dates from the beginning of the system. In 1835 the Commissioners suggested in their Report the desirableness of establishing thirty-two Model Schools, one for every county in Ireland. But this has never been carried out. Even at the present time there are but twenty-seven, and it was not until 1849, that is, nearly twenty years after the beginning of the system, that any provincial Model Schools were opened. There is no doubt that these are excellent schools, although the want of local management is a serious disadvantage in some respects, however advantageous in others, and would of itself limit the multiplication of such schools. In these schools the pupil-teacher system is properly carried out; they are excellently organized, and they embody the ideas of combined literary and moral and separate religious instruction, as the Board would like to have these applied in all the National Schools of Ireland.

At first the Roman Catholic hierarchy were strongly in favour of the establishment of Model Schools on this plan. But for more than ten years past, since the influence of Paul Cullen rose to the ascendant in Ireland, they have bitterly denounced them. They now covet them, as Ultramontane establishments, in connection with which to train Roman Catholic teachers for *such* denominational schools as they would have established. I regret to say that in this, as in a number of other points, the "Report of the Royal Commission" seems to incline far too much towards the Ultramontane demands. If the Commissioners would not concede all that Cardinal Cullen desires as to this particular,

they would at all events abolish these noble school establishments.

I have already intimated that there is much in the Irish system to admire. The Time-table Conscience Clause is an invaluable element in the system, and has, in effect, been transferred by means of Mr. Forster's Education Act to our English schools. It furnishes the best solution of the religious difficulty. Whilst the English nation should utterly protest against any proposal to make the Irish system more denominational, it is not desirable, on the other hand, that it should be stripped and peeled down through all the ordinary school-hours to as barely secular a system of instruction as would seem to be required by the new Act in our English inspected schools. At the same time, to have a system of schools without local committees, under the government, each one, of a patron, who is, besides, usually a priest or clergyman, and to give to such patrons an absolutely irresponsible control over the teachers—all this seems to call very loudly for redress and reformation. Assuredly, too, the fatal, and, I had almost said, disgraceful, concession to the Roman Catholic Church, by which convent sisters and monastic brothers are, as such, accepted by the Board as qualified public teachers, without any Government examination or any trial whatever, ought, on every account, to be immediately repealed.

I have shown that the existing system is virtually a denominational system, and yet Cardinal Cullen is persistent in his demands for what he calls a denominational system in Ireland ; and men, either for want of any real knowledge of what the Irish system is, or to secure the advantage of an ignorant and passionate party cry, are perpetually repeating the assertion that

either secularism must be established in England on the ruins of all denominational and all Christian voluntary schools, or else we shall be compelled to concede the Cardinal's demands. These men speak of the Irish system as a secular and undenominational system. How absolutely contrary to fact all this is I have fully shown, and I have no more to say on that point. But to some it may perhaps seem strange that, if the existing system in Ireland is virtually denominational, the Roman Catholic prelates should desire to change a system so favourable to the denominations. But we must not forget that the policy of Ultramontanism is absolutely exclusive. Many Roman Catholic children attend Protestant schools in Ulster; in parts of the same province, and elsewhere, where there is a numerous Protestant minority among a Roman Catholic majority, Protestant children attend Roman Catholic schools, and are visited and catechized at the schools by their own ministers; both these facts are unfavourable to the exclusive claims of the Ultramontane hierarchy. The National System, on the whole, tends to produce liberty of thought and liberality of feeling. A strictly and fully denominational system, managed absolutely by the priesthood or the confraternities, would be immensely more congenial to the spirit and favourable to the waning power, but unabated claims, of Ultramontane Romanism.

The denominational system of education which the Ultramontane party demand as their right is in entire antithesis to all the principles on which the State deals with denominational schools in this country; is, indeed, essentially opposed to the principles of the late Privy Council Code as well as

to the present New Code of the Department; is as extreme in its Ultramontane arrogance and exclusiveness as the worst system of education which the Pope and the Jesuits, by the most exacting of Concordats, ever imposed upon Austria in the days of her most servile and reactionary superstition; and is such as is not conceded to Rome in any Roman Catholic country at the present moment. The lower the Papacy falls in its fortunes, the smaller the real power of Roman Catholicism grows in Ireland, the louder, the larger, the more daring are the demands of Cardinal Cullen. There is a certain wisdom, no doubt, in the method. The unabashed aggressor who would in vain appeal to equity, and who knows better than to resort to actual force, will often try to carry his point by loud and persistent demands and threats.

All parties in this country, except a few Ultramontanes, whatever their politics and whatever their ecclesiastical denomination may be, are utterly and immovably opposed to the Irish Ultramontane demands. It is well that the leaders of the Birmingham agitation are opposed to these demands. But Mr. Forster occupies as firm and impregnable, and as thoroughly consistent a position, from which to refuse or oppose Cardinal Cullen, as it is possible for man to hold. Mr. Forster has disdenominationalised the English voluntary schools to the utmost possible extent, notwithstanding that the denominational managers must still find, in fees and subscriptions (one or both), at least half the cost; the Cardinal demands that the Irish National Schools shall be made denominational in the fullest and most absolute sense, although in many of them not a

farthing is contributed by the managers towards their cost, either in fees or in any other way, but the whole charge lies upon the State, and in the rest next to nothing is contributed. Mr. Forster has done away with denominational inspection here, and made the undenominational State inspection much more independent and searching than before. Cardinal Cullen demands that books, methods, teachers, and inspectors should be all and wholly "Catholic," and entirely under uncontrolled and unshared priestly direction. Mr. Forster has made a stringent conscience clause binding upon all the inspected schools in this country; Cardinal Cullen demands that in "Catholic" (not in Protestant) schools in Ireland the conscience clause shall be removed and done away with. Mr. Forster has only to carry out for Ireland the principles he has embodied in his Education Act for this country, has only to proffer the Cardinal our English denominationalism, and the Cardinal will be effectually floored.

Mr. Forster's is, in fact, the only basis on which it is possible for an English statesman to settle the educational policy of England. This policy must be an Imperial policy. It must rest on the same fundamental principles, whether it has to deal with education for England, or Ireland, or Scotland. The very argument, mistaken as it is in its assumptions, pressed by Mr. Dixon and Mr. Dale assumes this postulate. It implies that the same fundamental principle must govern in Ireland as well as in England. Let us, as we are bound, add Scotland to England and Ireland; then what have we? Secularism abhorrent to Ireland; not less abhorrent to Scotland. Secularism cannot then be established for England. In Ireland the ordinary education of

the National Schools is, in its common and central character, Christian, religious, although not in a denominational sense. In Scotland the common education is to be not only Christian and religious, but positively dogmatic. The Westminster catechism is to be taught in the rate-built schools. In neither country is the school-teacher silenced as a Christian teacher; in both he is expected to teach morality and religion. In the Scotch common school, as in the English Board school, the clergy, as such, have no authority or status whatever. In Ireland they give instruction in the schools at certain fixed times; but their instruction is not regarded as a part of the common, the statutory, the legally necessary, instruction. In both Ireland and Scotland as much common religious instruction and influence is incorporated with the universal education as can be practically accomplished. The existing English system is in harmony with this principle; a secular system would be entirely opposed to it.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

I HAVE already referred incidentally to the foundation of popular education in Scotland. In that country, as in the Protestant countries of the Continent, the Reformation laid the basis of popular education firmly and deeply at least throughout the Lowlands. But the case of England is one which requires special study and explanation. It is, in fact, altogether peculiar, unlike that of any other country whatever. In this chapter, accordingly, I shall endeavour clearly, although it must needs be slightly, to sketch the rise of popular education in England.

No doubt it is true that what England has had of popular education in the past was due almost wholly to the Reformation, so far as this took hold of England. But the Reformation in England never reached the ground of national society and life. The common people remained, for the most part, Roman Catholics; of the landed gentry, not nearly one-half can be said to have received the new ideas; only the mercantile classes, as a whole, embraced the Reformation. It was not till after the defeat of the Spanish Armada that the more moderate among the Catholic

knights and squires, "who were scattered over the shires, transformed themselves," as Mr. Froude says, "into Catholics with a difference, Anglo-Catholics or High Churchmen." "That defeat," to quote again from the same historian, "was the sermon which completed the conversion of the English nation, and transformed the Catholics into," not Protestants, not explicit adherents of the Reformation, but "Anglicans," *i.e.* members of the National and partially reformed Catholic Church, separated from the Pope, and acknowledging the supremacy of the English Sovereign.

The sum is, that in England the Reformation never moulded, never remoulded, the national institutions, and effected comparatively little for national education. Many free grammar schools were founded, intended for the education of the poor. But the parish school and the parish teacher did not, as in Scotland under the institutions which the intellect of the great Scotch Reformer moulded, become a part of the ecclesiastical discipline of England, laying a basis of education level with the mass of the population. And the free grammar schools in the towns, being mere corporations, and in no way quickened or controlled by the running stream of intellectual progress or national life, presently became corruptly managed and worthless institutions. The nation remained without a school system. The peasantry remained in a serf-like condition; they were bound to the soil by the law of settlement, they were endowed by the parish with the cold and miserable charity of a demoralising poor-rate. Until far into the eighteenth century, manufactures occupied comparatively few hands; and sometimes, as in Norwich, the condition of the craftsman appears to have been almost

worse than that of the prædial labourer.* With the exception of the skilled artisans, only the hand-loom cloth-weaver of the village or the small town, who not only owned his loom but held some land, seems to have been in a condition approaching to comfort and independence; and these cloth-weavers, mostly of Dutch, Flemish, or Huguenot race, were Protestants and lovers of books, the progenitors of the Independents and Baptists of modern times, who, in small congregations, maintain still a tenacious footing in the localities where those old Protestant work-people lived.

The purely English, and especially the purely agricultural, peasantry never received into their souls the light and quickening of the Reformation. It was not for them, as the style and matter agree to prove, that the great preachers, whether of the Anglo-Catholic or the Puritan school, elaborated their discourses, weighty with scholastic thought and brocaded with the learned splendour of classical and patristic quotation. The wants and capacity of the labourer seem to have been as remote from the purpose of the divine as his condition and claims from the care of the contemporary chronicler. Until the Methodists reached some—only some, only a few of them—they were left much where the Reformation had found and left them. The last preachers who had reached their level, and taught them any lessons that went home and stayed by them, were the preaching friars, save here and there a Latimer in one age and sphere, or a Bunyan in another, with a very few who had drunk into their spirit. Even to this day the peasantry of the South and West of England

* Macaulay's History of England, vol. i. pp. 416-417, 8vo edition.

have not forgotten the teaching and preaching of the friars. The lessons remain in not a few quaint and rude superstitions, half heathenish and half monkish, which retain their hold among our rural peasantry. They remain also in the evening devotions which to this day are taught by Wessex and Devonian peasant mothers to their children. The Rev. F. G. Lee, author of "Directorium Anglicanum," who is the *modiste* and posture-master of our modern Ultra-Ritualists, derives great satisfaction from the root of ancient monkish devotion which he finds among the peasantry. He speaks, in one of his "poems," of "a golden-haired child, with large blue eyes, gathering violets fair," and he gives us, in congenial doggerel, the child's evening prayer :—

> "'I put my hands together like this,
> When I go to bed alone,
> And I always say what my mother taught,'
> Then she said in monotone—

(there is a characteristic touch from the master of tones, gestures, ceremonies, and vestments)—

> 'Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John,
> Bless the bed I lie upon;
> Four corners to my bed,
> Four angels at my head;
> One to sing and one to pray,
> And two to carry my soul away;
> And if I die before I wake,
> I pray to God my soul to take,
> For Jesus Christ our Saviour's sake.
> Amen.'"

The child's mother was dead, the lyrist tells us, and so adds :—

> "If one is gone
> Methought you have Another."

Meaning either the Virgin Mother, Mary, or the Holy

Church, it is hard to say which. The prayer, however, is the point in view. It is, as Mr. Lee's production truly implies, by no means yet obsolete.

The Reformation, then, brought to the common country folk of England no new dispensation, no immediate enlightenment or elevation. They remained very much as they had been for some generations. Some were dieted in coarsest plenty; many were stinted to the hardest and leanest fare, and became in consequence a small and degenerate race; all were too ignorant, depressed, and helpless to attempt any combination or make any effort for their elevation; the whole class was beneath the notice of the contemporary annalist, and, if we must judge by published and extant sermons, even beneath the recognition of the educated preacher. We hear much of the upper and middle classes; we hear something of discontented handicraftsmen; we read in statutes and chronicles of "sturdy and valiant beggars," of vagrants and thieves; but of the peasantry of England we scarcely catch a glimpse or hear a sound from the time of Jack Cade down to the last century. Such a class was beneath education.

Our modern educational movement, which has been slowly gathering power and taking form in this country now for almost a hundred years, is due to the general forces which have come into operation since the beginning of the last century. Of these the Evangelical revival among the English Churches has been one, and one of the greatest. Another has been the vast and deep European tide of movement of which the fearful French Revolution was the most momentous result. Another has been the aggregation of people in large towns and thickly populated

districts, owing to the development of manufacturing industry. These causes together have forced the subject of education upon the public attention. Christian philanthropists took the work to heart long before statesmen acknowledged its importance. Wesley, Raikes, Bell, Lancaster, preceded Brougham and Birkbeck. In 1805 the excellent British and Foreign School Society took its rise; 1811 saw the foundation of the great National School Society of the Church of England. Since about the year 1780, Sunday-schools had been increasing and multiplying with wonderful rapidity. In 1815, or thereabouts, a noble young man began to acquire his first experience as a teacher in Sunday-schools, who was destined to become the greatest benefactor to children this century has produced—the greatest, as the first and most original master of the science and art of Christian training: I mean David Stow. For nearly half a century David Stow pursued his course, beginning in unostentatious privacy, ending in view of all the world. He was the means of revolutionising the methods of teaching, of developing the principles and science of training, of ascertaining and working out the process by which the mind and heart of a child might be most surely awakened and drawn forth into contact and communion with truth and sympathy, with intellectual and moral light and life. He was the founder and organizer of the Glasgow Training System and Training College, to which the education of this country and of the world owes so much.

It was not till some time after the zeal of Christian philanthropists had begun to glow in the cause of religious education, that the needs and rights of the

people, in regard to general education, began to make an impression on Parliament and the country at large. The same causes had not operated in this country as in the foremost countries of the Continent to lead statesmen to feel the necessity of making the reorganization and renovation of primary education a matter of immediate and paramount political concern and national legislation. The republican institutions and instincts of Switzerland and Holland have made those countries the strongholds of popular education politically organized; in Switzerland low in its range, in Holland much more liberal, but in both countries clear, good, universally diffused. The French Revolution, springing out of the idea of republican equality, has also led in France to the eventual reorganization and the wide diffusion of public instruction. In Germany, the necessity felt for erecting a prostrate people and uniting a divided fatherland and race, in order to resist Napoleon, led Prussian statesmen sixty years ago to abolish serfdom and to revive and extend education. The immunity of England from revolutionary violence; its security from foreign attack; its isolation from the Continent, and its antagonism to France and French ideas; the immense wealth and power of its aristocracy; the serried strength and merely material culture of its middle classes; and the absorption of the capital and energies of the most energetic and progressive classes of the people in manufactures and operative industry —have combined to seclude this nation from the educational progress which has marked the history of other European countries. Our political and politically represented classes have been busy, have been making money, have had no taste for ideas, have

often had a positive dread of education for those beneath them, have not seldom associated the thought of education with the fear of revolution.

For the last fifty years, however, things have been rapidly changing. The change has been registered in Parliamentary progress. The speeches of Brougham, and the Parliamentary inquiries of which he was the first great promoter, and of which there has been a long and frequent succession throughout a period of nearly sixty years ; the action of Parliament in giving to a Special Committee of the Privy Council wide and summary powers in regard to public education ; and, in particular, the Minutes of the Council issued respectively in the years 1839, 1846, and 1862—have brought us to our present position. The names of Brougham, Lansdowne, Russell, Shuttleworth, Pakington, Forster, with others of scarcely inferior distinction, are honourably inscribed in the Parliamentary annals of educational progress for this country.

The action of Christian philanthropists and of Christian Churches in the matter of religious, and also in part of secular, education for the people preceded, as I have shown, any interposition by the State in the matter of general education. The first national grant in aid of education was voted in 1833, on the motion, in the Commons' House, of Lord Althorp. It amounted only to £20,000. It was distributed by the Treasury for six years, and was appropriated only to the building of schools connected with the National School Society, or the British and Foreign School Society. In 1839, as I have said, the Committee of Council on Education was organized, and the beginning, in slight and

humble proportions, was made of a system which has now expanded to a large growth. In 1846 the general principles of the existing system of aid to denominational and British schools were put forth by the Council. But for fifty years before the earliest of these dates (*i.e.*, before 1833) the tide of religious effort on behalf of Sunday-schools had set in, and for about a quarter of a century the British and Foreign and the National School Societies had been engaged, under the management of earnest Christian men, in diffusing a general education in which Christian principles constituted a fundamental element. After the State had begun to recognise the work of national education as a charge and duty belonging in part, at least, and in a very practical and important sense, to itself, it could not be but that the Churches and the State should be brought into relation with each other through their respective relations to the same common work. In fact, the State, in aiding the National Society, was directly aiding the Church of England in the work of education. It could not always be that other Churches would be excluded from receiving State help in return for their co-operation with the State in the matter of public education. It was inevitable that, starting as it did in this work so late, and after the Churches had so long been diligently engaged in it, and had accomplished so much that was permanently of inestimable value, in respect of methods of education and training no less than of schools founded and scholars gathered in, the State should, when it entered upon the field, recognise fully and liberally the rights which the Churches had at least acquired, if they did not originally possess, in the matter of national education.

It is important, moreover, to note the special ground on which the State did at length interpose on behalf of the education of the people. It was, primarily, on behalf of morality and society, on behalf of Christian civilisation, that the Government took action ; it was not for the sake of developing, by State legislation and action, by public outlay and national organization, the intellectual progress or the material resources of the nation. It was because, thirty years ago, all English statesmen saw clearly that, while the children of the English people were doubtless lamentably wanting in education generally, what they stood in need of first and most of all was distinctively Christian culture and influence, that these statesmen found themselves compelled to move Parliament to interpose in order to do whatever might be done towards reclaiming and elevating the oncoming generations of their countrymen. What was imperatively needed, what was needed before all else in the judgment of her Majesty and of her Majesty's Ministers, for the children of the working people of England, was that their consciences should be awakened and enlightened, that their religious sensibilities should be kindled and developed, that what has been spoken of as *a Christian consciousness* should be formed within them. To a sad and very alarming extent the lower classes were found, on careful inquiry, to be sunk far below the level of anything like a "Christian consciousness," to be utterly barbarous and irreligious. Under these circumstances it was felt that before all things it was necessary that religion should be applied, that Christianity should be brought home to the children of the people of England, so that by degrees the

generations of this Protestant country might be imbued with something like a Christian character. This was not the conclusion of enthusiastic or one-idead Christian philanthropists, but of statesmen, of all the statesmen of all parties. As to this particular there was no controversy, no variety of opinion, among the leading public men of English political parties thirty or forty years ago.

It is not well to forget to-day the language used by Lord Russell, in 1839, in his famous "Letter to the Marquis of Lansdowne," conveying the Queen's judgment and wishes in regard to the work of national education. This letter, I may observe in passing, was in a sense the very charter of the Educational Department of the Privy Council, since it was the medium through which her Majesty thought proper to make known her royal pleasure in reference to the constitution of a special and separate department for primary education in connection with the Privy Council, of which Council the Marquis of Lansdowne was at that time Lord President. Lord John Russell says that—

"Her Majesty has observed with deep concern the want of instruction which is still to be found among the poorer classes of her subjects. All the inquiries which have been made," he continues, "show a deficiency in the general education of the people, which is not in accordance with the character of a civilised and Christian nation. The reports of the chaplains of gaols show that, to a large number of unfortunate prisoners, a knowledge of the fundamental truths of natural and revealed religion has never been imparted."

Further on it is observed in the same letter that,

"in any normal or model school to be established by the Board, four principal objects are to be kept in view: *first, religious instruction;* second, general instruction; third, moral training; fourth, habits of industry." Again his lordship states, in memorable words, that "it is her Majesty's wish that the youth of her kingdom should be religiously brought up, and that the rights of conscience should be respected." His lordship also says that, "by combining moral training with general instruction, the young may be saved from the temptation to crime, and the whole community receive indisputable benefits;" and, in the final words of his letter, he speaks of the plans in contemplation by the Government as "plans for the extension of the blessing of a sound religious education." I might fortify these quotations, if there were any necessity for it, by citing passage after passage from a remarkable pamphlet which was published in the same year, 1839, by Dr. James Phillips Kay, as he was then called, but who is now known by the title of Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth. He was appointed the first Secretary of the Educational Department of the Committee of Privy Council; and in that capacity he published a pamphlet which explained and defended the principles and the plans of the Government in regard to education. In this pamphlet he lays it down repeatedly, and most emphatically, that the intention of the Government was, by means of a sound education — moral, religious, and intellectual — to educate the whole man; and especially by such means to reclaim the lower classes of our people from that condition of lawlessness, demoralisation, and degradation in which multitudes of them were at that time sunk. He explains that it was the intention of the

Government by these means to infuse humanising and Christian influences into the midst of the lower fabric of society, in order that we might no longer have to blush because of the prevalence within this country of a low state of morals and manners, such as was a disgrace to the name of Christianity. It was, then, upon these principles that the Education Department of the Privy Council was, in the first instance, constituted.

It was under the influence of such views and principles that Lord Melbourne's administration, in 1839, made the first serious and worthy attempt, by means of national legislation, to deal with the question of national education for England. The Government proposed, in fact, to adapt to the case of England the leading principles of the great measure of national education which had, a few years before, been carried into operation in Ireland. But that which was the best, if only because it was the only, system which could be carried out in Ireland five-and-thirty years ago, met with a decisive opposition from a large majority of the earnest and orthodox Protestants of England. In fact, the number and variety of denominations in this country, and the amount of passive nominally Protestant ignorance and irreligion among the lower classes of English people, made the problem of education then, as now, quite different for the two countries, and the project of united education, although, at first sight, it might have appeared easier, in reality more difficult for this country than for that. The Government went to work like statesmen. They did not propose to reform the morals and manners of masses of ignorant and irreligious people merely by means of secular instruction; nor

did they propose to cover the country with schools, and enact a direct compulsory law of education, before they had made provision for training an adequate supply of competent teachers. They proposed to found, in the first instance, a normal college, with its model school. It was with them a first principle, that "the religious instruction of the candidate teachers should form an essential and prominent element of their studies," and that "no certificate should be granted unless the authorised religious teacher had previously attested his confidence in the character, religious knowledge, *and zeal* of the candidates whose religious instruction he had superintended." To impart the requisite religious instruction to the candidate teachers, *i.e.*, the students in the college, a clergyman of the Established Church was to have been appointed chaplain, to act under the general direction of the rector, who was to have been a layman, and who would have been at the head of the whole institution, including both training college and model school. But to meet the case of candidate teachers who might be Nonconformists, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, besides the chaplain, "the licensed minister" of any such candidates, if a wish to that effect were expressed, was to have authority to attend at stated times, in order "to assist and examine the candidates in their religious reading, and to afford them spiritual advice." In the model school, religious instruction was to have been regarded "as general and special;" general, inasmuch as, to quote the words of the minute, "religion was to be combined with the whole matter of instruction, and to regulate the entire system of discipline;" and special, inasmuch as "periods" were to be "set apart

for such peculiar doctrinal instruction as might be required for the religious training of the children." The chaplain was "to conduct the religious instruction of children whose parents or guardians belonged to the Established Church," while "licensed ministers" were to give special religious instruction to the children of Nonconformists when the number of such children appeared to the school committee to be so large as to require this provision to be made. The Scriptures were to be read in the schools; and, to meet the case of Roman Catholic scholars, it was felt needful to allow, in their special instance, the use of the Roman Catholic version.

Such was, in outline, the famous scheme of 1839. I do not hesitate to say that it was honestly and patriotically intended; that it was both religious and liberal in its spirit; and that it was, in its conception, worthy of Christian statesmen. Nevertheless, it had a fatal fault—it was impracticable. Such a scheme furnished no solvent by which the denominations could be held together in pellucid tranquillity within the same institution. In Ireland, where, thirty years ago, three different denominations would have comprised all the children in nearly all the schools, the elements which it was hoped to hold together in peaceful neighbourship and diffused neutrality, have, in a large majority of cases, separated from each other and crystallized apart. The Irish system, as we have seen, has long been a predominantly denominational system. In England the proposed system was even more impracticable.

The Government proposals evoked a tempestuous opposition. The Church of England opposed them with all its forces. The Wesleyan Methodists were

scarcely less vehement or resolute in their opposition. The scheme was opposed, not only as impracticable, but as favouring Popery, and, at the same time, as "tending to produce a dangerous spirit of scepticism and unbelief." The Government proposals, I need scarcely add, were withdrawn.

The Whigs having made their attempt, and failed, it was the turn next of the Conservative party to try their hand on a settlement of the great question of popular education. The Whigs had encountered the opposition of Churchmen and Conservative Christian educationists generally, the Conservatives were to call forth the indignant antagonism of all English Nonconformists, the Wesleyan Methodists included. I need not spend any time in describing the famous proposals of 1843, which Sir James Graham spoke of as his "olive branch," but which, erring from a despotic simplicity, and not, like those of Lord Melbourne's Administration, from too great a complication, would have handed over the primary education of the country to the Anglican clergy. Powerful as the Government was, and supported by the clergy and large majorities in both Houses of Parliament, they were obliged to give way before the storm which broke forth from every quarter of Nonconformity, and which, growing more terrible every day, threatened to sweep all before it.

Twice foiled in its endeavours to secure for the generations of English children an effective Christian education, Parliament was yet constrained to renew the attempt. It was impossible, in view of the actual condition of England in the period 1841-1846, to let this question rest. General uneasiness and discontent among the working people of England,

especially in the northern provinces; Chartist organization and conspiracies; growing excesses of social vice and profligacy; the revelations and recommendations of Committees and Commissions; the urgency of the benevolent, the fears of the grave and thoughtful;—all concurred to impress upon each Government in succession that, in some way, practically at least if not with an ideal consistency, approximately if not completely, the problem of national education must be solved.

No other way seemed now to be left but for the State to work in partnership with the denominations. The barely secular plan, it is true, had not been tried. But thirty years ago England had not yet found, nor indeed has it found even to-day, any responsible statesman, any adviser of the Sovereign, who would propose for the nation a bare plan of secular education.

I have referred to a pamphlet by Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth, which was published in 1839, to prepare the way for the Government action of that period. In 1846, the same gentleman published a second official pamphlet, to prepare the way for the Government action which was actually taken in that year. In this pamphlet he explains the views which up to this period had been held by English statesmen as to popular education. It is worth while to quote from that pamphlet one or two significant and suggestive passages:—

"It was scarcely believed then"—that is, in 1839—says Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth, writing in 1846 on behalf of the Government, and in exposition of the principles of the new Government plan, "that it could enter into the conception of statesmen to re-

gard religion as a primary and indispensable part of education. They (the majority of the clergy and laity) imagined that the statesmen of this country relied solely on the cultivation of the intellect, and on the spread of secular knowledge, for the growth of a higher morality, and for the promotion of the public order and well-being of society; and, while they justly repudiated the gross and mischievous error that a purely secular knowledge was capable of establishing society on an immutable basis of social order, or was even necessarily connected with a high condition of public morality, it is to be apprehended that they had fallen into the opposite fallacy, and were not convinced how important it was to raise the intellectual condition of the people for the purpose of promoting the growth of true religion."

The same authority further says :—

"The Government had never wavered in its adherence to the principle adopted in 1839, that 'religion should be mixed with the entire matter of instruction in the school, and regulate the whole of its discipline;' and the perseverance of successive Governments in the adoption of the principle that religion is the foundation on which education must be built, has vindicated statesmen from the suspicion to which we have previously alluded, that they valued education chiefly because of their confidence in the influence of purely secular learning."

In 1846, accordingly, the secular principle of national education was quite out of the question for this country. Indeed, at that time there was no precedent in the history of the world for a secular scheme of national education, except the abortive paper schemes of the French Revolution, which had

brought forth no fruit whatever, but the destruction of the only people's schools in France. Such being the case, there remained now, as I have said, no possible way left for the State to contribute its part towards satisfying the crying needs of the country, except by co-operating with the denominations, which had already done so much in the way of providing schools, which, indeed, had, between them, already covered much the larger part of the ground with school provision. The Conservative Government had tried the principle of State co-operation with the State Church alone in order to do the needful work. The country had rejected that principle. The Whigs, a few years earlier, had attempted to apply to England the principles of unsectarian and mixed national provision of education, as in Ireland. But the country would not hear of that. The secular plan was altogether out of the question. Except partnership with all the denominations, what possible plan remained? It has been seen that, on the Continent, the experience of France and Germany had compelled the different States to accept the conclusion that public elementary education could only be secured and regulated by the State in conjunction with the different Churches. But, as I have before shown, the problem was simpler and easier for Continental States than for England, because there, beside the two or three State-supported Churches in each country, there were no other denominations of any material importance. The Dissenters of the Continent are few and feeble. Whereas in this country there is but one Established Church, and the various Dissenting and Nonconformist sects include nearly half the population, and are equally spirited

and powerful. No State arrangement as to education, accordingly, could be effected, which did not place the Nonconformist Churches on something like an equal footing, as to co-operation, with the Church by law established.

The difficulties in the way of any direct or comprehensive legislation on the subject were indeed at that time insuperably great; but a series of experiments, under the direction of the Privy Council Executive for the time being—the Educational Committee of the Privy Council—was organized in 1846 (some beginning indeed, as we have seen, had been made in 1839), and having been carried on for five-and-twenty years, prepared the way for the legislation of 1870. Parliament sanctioned, year by year, the grant proposed, as an item of the Estimates, and sanctioned also, by simply voting the money, or by raising no objection, or refusing to ratify an objection raised, the rules and regulations for the administration of the grants which, from time to time, were issued by the Department, having, in regard to important points, been previously laid on the table of the House. But no measure was proposed; and no large principles were discussed. In the case, indeed, of the proposal by the Department to introduce the principle of the Irish National System, the country and Parliament were roused to object to the method in which the Government proposed to apply the grant, as more than twenty years later the school interest of the country was aroused to oppose Mr. Lowe's proposals in the way of revising the then existing code of regulations. But, as a rule, the Executive was left to spend and regulate at discretion, objection being only taken from time to time to the

growing amount of the grant. Thus, by a tentative and experimental process, was the public school system of this country moulded, until a few years ago the time was ripe for a comprehensive national system. The foundations of this system had been laid by the thirty years' administration of the Privy Council Department, and national experience had been gathered of the very highest value. The Privy Council pilot-engine prepared the way for the legislative train of 1870. The Council had already, also, for the most of the way, laid down the road.

The epochs of our public elementary school history are 1833, 1839, 1846, 1862, 1870. In 1833, as we have seen, small special grants were first voted by Parliament in aid of the National and the British and Foreign School Societies. In 1839 the Privy Council Department for Education was organized, and the Parliamentary grant was enlarged. The Government plan for introducing a national mixed and unsectarian system of education was defeated, but grants began to be made by Government direct to schools in England, and soon afterwards in Scotland, which were organized on a certain basis (either Church of England or Protestant unsectarian,* or, in Scotland, orthodox Presbyterian), and which placed themselves under Government inspection; and thus the all-important matter of Government inspection began to be organized. In 1846 the famous Minutes of Council were published, which laid the foundation of the English public elementary school system. In accordance with these new regulations, large and liberal grants were to be made to aid in erecting, and annual grants to help in maintaining, Normal or

* Schools of the British and Foreign School Society.

Training Colleges; liberal building grants also were offered towards the erection of new schools, and annual grants to aid in their maintenance. The annual grants to schools consisted of an augmentation grant to the teacher, as trained and certificated for public service, and grants for the instruction of pupil-teachers—suspended on the condition that the schools should be under Government inspection, and that pupil-teachers should be employed in them in certain proportions. In 1862 Mr. Lowe introduced his Revised Code, antagonistic in certain respects to the Minutes of 1846, but which, whatever its demerits, introduced into the administration of the Department the convenient principle of "payment by results," a fruitful principle in its after applications.

Government inspection, trained and certificated teachers, the pupil-teacher system, and payment by results—these are now the great features of the English system of public elementary day-schools. All these features, except the last—for which in his official term as Secretary the time was not ripe—were the fruits of the sagacity and earnest purpose of the first Secretary for Education of the Privy Council, Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth. He had retired many years from office, in broken health, when, in the time of his successor, Mr. Lingen, and under the vice-presidency of Mr. Lowe, the Revised Code of 1862 was introduced. For ten years (1839-1849) he had held office, and this country owes no common debt to him.

On the Continent Government action takes a denominational form, and adapts itself explicitly to denominational requirements. In this country no union between the Government and the Churches could be

arranged on such a basis. The Churches needed to maintain their entire separateness from the Government in the management of their schools. Certain conditions they would gladly fulfil, for the sake of Government inspection and aid ; they would observe certain rules in the organization of their school. But their committees must be exclusively Church Committees, and in no sense must any of their members or agents be State officials. Their ordinary management must go on as if there were no Government or Government officials in existence, save only that they were to be financially benefited and aided by Government, and were prepared to give all respect to the suggestions of Government or Government inspectors with a view to the increased efficiency of their schools. It was on such terms that the State in 1846 entered into partnership with the denominations for the education of the people.

There was, however, as at that date there could hardly but have been, a difference in the manner in which the Government dealt with Church of England schools and with Nonconformist schools respectively as regarded religious instruction. The inspectors of the schools of the Church of England were all clergymen of that Church, and were required to examine or inspect, at their annual visit, the religious as well as the secular instruction. The inspectors of other schools were all laymen, and had no power or liberty to take any cognisance of religious instruction. Government, however, made no grants to any schools which were not organized on a religious basis. True to the influences under which the State first undertook to interfere in regard to national education, convinced that nothing but a Christian education would

meet the requirements of the country, Government would extend no aid to any schools which were not organized on a religious basis. In all schools, except Roman Catholic schools, instruction in the Holy Scriptures was an indispensable condition. Roman Catholic schools were not provided for under the original Minutes of 1846, but were included in the general arrangement two or three years later. In all schools, except those of the Church of England, the certificate of the managers that they were satisfied with the state of the religious knowledge in the school was accepted instead of any examination.

It was a defect in the administration of the Department during this period, that no provision was made for an individual examination and appraising of the attainments of each particular child, and that no part of the Government grant was made to depend on the results of this examination. This, however, was not the fault of Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth. In 1853 he drew up and urged the adoption of a Minute to this effect, but the Committee of the Council did not see their way to its adoption. From 1846 he had had such an arrangement in view. Perhaps it might not have been wise to press this at a very early period.

The effect of these Minutes was immense. They brought more than a million of children into inspected Government schools in fifteen years,* and led to the erection of forty training colleges. The system was doubtless one of artificial stimulation, not destined, not expected, to endure for many years without modification, but wisely generous in its con-

* The number *present* at inspection in 1862 was in Great Britain upwards of a million.

ception and in all its provisions. Only a treatment of the case by means of generous stimulants could have produced any adequate effect in improving, extending, and efficiently applying the national provision of elementary education in England.

Certainly neither Sir J. P. Kay-Shuttleworth nor the friends of public education generally, nor, so far as appears, any other party in the country, anticipated that the principles of the scheme of 1846 would be interfered with so soon, or so rudely, as they were by Mr. Lowe's Revised Code of 1862. To understand the principles on which Mr. Lowe proceeded in the revolution which he attempted, but was only able in part to effect, we must regard the Revised Code as it was when he first introduced it. It proceeded on two principles: one was that public education ought to be paid for out of State funds only on the principle of pauper relief; the other was that whatever was paid for, in other than confessedly pauper schools, ought to be paid for only as secular instruction, and on the basis, and according to the amount, of strictly tested and ascertained secular "results" of instruction. Payment as poor relief; payment according to rigidly ascertained results of secular instruction—these were the principles of his "Revised Code;" both in themselves scientific and statesmanlike principles, but the first of the two utterly inapplicable in the existing condition of England as to popular education, especially elementary education, and the second premature, if strictly applied.

In accordance with the first of these two principles, the Revised Code proposed to deal out the dole of elementary education to the people

as the Poor-law would proceed in the case of administering assistance to the indigent. In quantity it was to be a minimum, and it was to be of the plainest quality—rigidly restricted to what was deemed necessary for poor labouring people; no grant for results was to be made in respect of any child who had either reached the upper age of eleven, or was too young an "infant" to pass the annual examination before the inspector, for infant-school training for poor men's children was a sentimental luxury, and before the age of eleven all poor men's children ought be away from school and to be at labour; and none but labouring people were to be allowed to send their children to the schools. Carrying out, as far as he dared, the same general principle, the Vice-President proposed to do away with the second year of training for students at Normal Colleges, and to reduce the Training College Syllabus of instruction to a low and narrow utilitarian standard, such as, no doubt, he regarded as more than sufficient for teachers whose business it was to be to teach such schools as he meant the public elementary schools to be.

I have already intimated that a just principle lay at the basis of Mr. Lowe's proposals, but that it was altogether inapplicable to the existing condition of English society. England was in the condition which Mr. Mill describes as exceptional, "when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself" (apart from the action of the State) "any proper institutions of education." "As the less of two evils," Government was, for the present—as it will be doubtless for a considerable period yet in the future—obliged

to interfere directly in the promotion and aid of "institutions of education." Apart from the measures which the State had taken, there would have been scarcely any really efficient elementary schools in the country; even after what Government had done during fifteen years, the number of really efficient schools was still far below the needs of the country; it was not only that there was a deficiency of such schools for the poor, there was an equal deficiency of competent elementary schools for all classes, and, in fact, the new inspected schools, intended primarily for the poor, were now seen to be the only schools in the country where tradespeople could, for the most part, expect to get an honest and real elementary education for their children; besides all which, even if there had been a larger number of private elementary schools of a genuine and honest character, such was the ignorance of parents generally as to what constituted a real education, that they were quite unable to distinguish the real teacher from the mischievous pretender. Under such educational conditions as these, affecting the whole country, Mr. Lowe's Revised Code was ridiculously inapplicable, and threatened wide and serious mischief to the education of the people.

The Revised Code further interfered with the existing arrangements as to pupil-teachers, greatly diminishing their number, diminishing also the amount of grant on their behalf, and loosening the dependence of the pupil-teacher on the chief teacher.

It required, also, that all the children in the schools should be grouped and classified for instruction and examination according to age—a regulation

which showed a sublime forgetfulness of existing facts as to child life and school conditions.

The capitation grant, that is, a grant per head on the number of children who had attended a certain number of times, had been introduced into the Code nearly ten years before, and was always extremely objectionable in principle, because it made the amount of grant earned by the teacher to depend on the accuracy of his own registers of the attendance of the children, the addition of but a single attendance, in some cases, making a claim to a grant for the year on behalf of a scholar who otherwise would earn no grant for the school. But the Revised Code would have indefinitely increased the demoralising inducement or temptation involved in the possibility of getting a grant by making a few attendances more than were actually registered in the first instance ;* for it proposed to make the whole Government grant to any school dependent on the number of the children's attendances over one hundred times, at the rate of one penny per head per school attendance, whether morning or afternoon, the grant for each child being reducible by one-third in case of failure on examination either in writing, or reading, or arithmetic, severally, and by two-thirds in the case of failure in two of these, and being wholly forfeited if the examination proved a failure in all the three. A capitation grant conditioned, at least in part, on attendance, has, in one form or other, continued ever since to be the principle of all payments made by the Education Department to inspected schools. Mr. Lowe was obliged, however, so far to modify his proposal as to make part of the grant dependent on the *average*

* A dot marks an attendance on the register.

attendance of the school. But the whole grant has, since 1862, depended, as at any rate one of the conditions, on registration of attendances by the teacher.

This demoralising feature in our English system ought to be got rid of at all hazards. The results of examination should, I venture to think, be taken, irrespective of the attendances of the children examined; and the average number in attendance should be calculated, as it might be with sufficient accuracy, upon the basis of the ratio between the amount of fees paid in by the teacher weekly on account of each department of the school and the fee charged for each child.

We have just seen that the modicum of instruction on which examination was to be made and payment to be obtained per child who passed was the barest minimum possible; that, in fact, it only included reading, writing, and arithmetic. It took no account, among its secular results to be paid for by grants, of geography, or grammar, or history! These subjects were afterwards, in the course of some years, brought in as extra subjects, and made paying subjects by special minutes of the Privy Council. Of course everything in the nature of elementary art and science—of which not a little had been included in Sir James P. Kay-Shuttleworth's original plan—was excluded by Mr. Lowe's revision. It has been the business of the Science and Art Department, working collaterally and independently, though in friendly relations, to bring forward such subjects as much as possible, during some years past, by special provisions and pecuniary inducements of which advantage can be taken in all elementary schools. Thus during the last eight or ten years the

rigid exclusiveness and studious narrowness of Mr. Lowe's Revised Code has been corrected.

Several of the proposals of the Revised Code were abandoned or modified at the time because of the pressure of public opinion. The grotesque and cruel proposal to make grants to infant schools entirely dependent on examination in the "three R's," and also the proposal to reduce the term of college training for teachers to one year, had to be abandoned. So, also, the Vice-President was obliged to abandon the idea of classifying and grouping, by force of law, at the examinations, all the children according to age. Even at this moment Government finds itself obliged from year to year to push forward the date at which a similar requirement is to be acted upon, notwithstanding twelve intervening years of educational progress, and the present pressure of compulsion. Perhaps in three or four years from the present time the idea may be carried out. Any practical educationist could not but have known that only in a completely educated nation, a nation in which a broad, pervasive, penetrating, thoroughgoing system had been in operation for years, could such an idea be carried into effect. Such a plan has not been fully carried out even in Germany; in England, in 1862, it was a demand at least fifteen years in advance of the times.

The best idea in Mr. Lowe's revision was, perhaps, that of Government payment for strictly and exclusively secular results, an idea which seems to have been first suggested by Mr. Miall in his Report as one of the sub-commissioners under the Duke of Newcastle's Commission. But even this was a premature proposal, and operated most unfairly for years. On the

original plan of 1846-7, indeed, whatever money was granted by Government was granted directly for literary results and attainments, whether as an "augmentation" to the teacher's salary on account of his certificate or as dependent on certain conditions of educational provision, such as the presence of an adequate staff of pupil-teachers, with properly built, appointed, and regulated class-rooms; and there was no strictly denominational condition or limitation, nor any doctrinal or definitely religious condition or limitation whatever, connected with these grants, the only absolute requirement of a moral or religious nature being that the school should either be in connection with a Christian Church, or that the Scriptures should be read in it. But there was this difference in the working of the two plans—the plan of 1846 and that of 1862. The original plan of 1846 went upon the generous assumption that where there was adequate attainment and training on the part of the teacher, and where he was properly assisted by an adequate staff, and properly placed in premises fitly constructed and furnished, there would not fail, on the whole—on an average—to be the educational results, moral and intellectual, which were desired. And it recognised distinctly the fact that the results sought for were not simply intellectual. Whereas the Revised Code made the State contribution to the school to be in a direct and simple proportion to the "secular" results merely, these results themselves being of the lowest and narrowest sort, merely reading, writing, and arithmetic. It treated all besides, whether in the way of moral influence or of information and instruction, as mere surplusage. It ignored the fact that large masses of

the children needed most and first of all to receive such civilising Christian culture as relates to the temper, the affections, the moral conceptions and habits; it ignored also the equally important fact, as respected such children, that they were mostly so rude and rugged, so ill-nurtured as well as ignorant, so barbarous in speech and thought and feeling, that a difficult and tedious preliminary work of training needed to be done upon them before they could be brought to the same level with others, to the proper starting-point from which children living in civilised homes would begin the course of elementary education. It neglected, also, to take account that these same classes of children were almost always exceedingly irregular in their attendance, so that a world of pains taken with them, during their fitful school-going, would often seem for a long time to produce scarcely any result in the way of ordinary school learning. Those, in short, who had to do the hardest, most needful, and most meritorious work, as child-trainers and rudimentary educators, were, by the Revised Code, placed at an insurmountable disadvantage as compared with others. A heavy fine was imposed on anything like missionary and philanthropic enterprise and service on the part of teachers. Those could not fail to make by far the most money who had to teach the well-disposed and fairly civilised children of the working classes in the larger towns, especially in the South and South Midland districts of England, where such rugged independence of style and manners, such ignorance of all conventional proprieties, as are common in many parts of the North of England, are unknown, and where the people, unlike the men of

the Northern country parts, grow up from their childhood to speak, not a broad and stiff provincial dialect, but the customary and flexible speech proper to school education and public reading.

No doubt it was right that there should be an individual examination of every scholar, and that some portion of the grant, enough to constitute a sensible inducement to individual painstaking, should be made dependent on the results of the examination. But to make the whole grant dependent on the bare results of mechanical instruction in the lowest rudiments of knowledge was not the way to elevate the teacher's ideal, to encourage the true spirit of training, or to secure what the country most needed. The Revised Code did much to infuse a low and mercenary spirit into the body of school teachers. It was wise to extricate the Government grant distinctly and evidently from all direct relation to any other than properly educational conditions and results, apart from any religious considerations whatever; it would have been right to constitute a direct and simple proportion between the Government payment and such school conditions, on the one hand, or such ascertained educational results, on the other hand, as were merely literary or intellectual, so that the Government payment might vary as these conditions or results varied. But, considering the very widely contrasted conditions and circumstances of children in different localities and different social or operative classes, Government aid should not, at that period, have been made to depend on mere examination results, nor should such results have been limited to the three bare elements which alone were recognised in the Code.

In the original printed draft of the Revised Code the grant to the school was reduced, as I have stated, to one amount, calculated at the rate of one penny for each attendance, morning or afternoon, of the scholar *after one hundred times*, reducible, however, by one-third for a failure in each or either of the three rudimentary subjects. Consequently, no teacher would receive anything for any child who had not been one hundred times at school —a most unfair condition, especially in the worst and lowest populations, where the work of the teacher could not but be the hardest and, if faithful, the most meritorious ; but where no amount of ability or devotion would be able to secure general regularity of attendance, or to prevent many children from shifting their quarters, with their parents, before they had attended, in the same year, one hundred meetings of the school. And whatever any teacher did get was to have been solely and entirely dependent on the rudimentary examinations in reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Mr. Lowe was compelled, on this point, to make a very large concession. His Code, as finally modified and sanctioned, provided for two grants ; one merely on average attendance, and the other on the results of the examination of those scholars who had attended two hundred meetings of the school. The grant to infant-schools was made liberal, and calculable on attendance only, for all children under six years of age.

Such is a general view of the famous Revised Code. Even after, in concession to the strong remonstrances of educationists, it had been greatly modified—made much milder, much less illiberal—

it still remained a memorial of *doctrinaire* economy of a hard, utilitarian type, such as knew nothing of generous wisdom, and little of concession to circumstances, in order to raise the population into better circumstances. Judicious liberality and bounty, at certain stages, may lead, and may be the only way leading, to economy and independence afterwards. This, however, was a doctrine which the framers of the Revised Code did not seem to have learnt.

Many further modifications have since been introduced in the Privy Council regulations, and now a New Code has followed the Revised Code. By degrees the Syllabus of Training College study has been brought back almost to the high standard adopted in the first years of Privy Council administration. So also the standard of school instruction has been enlarged and elevated, by annexing special pecuniary inducements to the teaching of certain extra subjects. But the aims and standard of the elementary teacher's work had been deeply lowered; the character of the class doubtless suffered greatly in consequence; the pupil-teacher supply was arrested for years. In fact, the profession could scarcely be said to have fairly recovered its position when the controversies which ushered in the Act of 1870 came to unsettle all feeling upon the subject, followed by the Act itself, which has now reorganized the whole of our national education on a broad and comprehensive basis.

In 1870, when the preliminary and tentative dispensation came to an end, and popular education in England was first organized by Act of Parliament, the number of scholars under instruction in inspected schools in England and Wales was 1,438,872, with

an average attendance of 1,153,572. The number in uninspected public schools was 688,555; and in private schools, high and low, as far as can be estimated, very nearly 1,000,000. The number of pauper children between five and thirteen was 164,873. The number left altogether without any pretence of school education could not fairly be reckoned at more than 400,000. But of those whose names were on the registers of even the inspected schools a large proportion attended so irregularly as to receive really nothing that could be called education, and to leave with but the slightest tincture of letters, while in the uninspected schools a much larger proportion were left virtually uneducated.*

In fact, to unprejudiced and well-informed persons, it had been evident for many years before the Privy Council dispensation of aid to voluntary schools was replaced by the present wider system, that that system alone, notwithstanding the vast and excellent results which it had produced, could not but fall short in one important respect. It could not reach the neediest spots. Where the poor were poorest and most alone and unaided in their poverty, where ignorance and degradation were the worst and the most neglected, the most deprived of neighbourly power or will to elevate or help, there the aided voluntary system was often powerless. Neither, of course, could voluntary zeal and benevolence, however great, avail to constrain negligent parents to send their children regularly to school, or to compel insensible parents to send at all to school the children who were growing up utterly undisciplined and un-

* See Note at the end of this chapter.

taught. As things were, accordingly, many spots were likely to remain without schools which sorely needed them, and the children who professed to go to school were likely many of them to grow up scarcely the least better for their schooling. Some method of effectual compulsion, it was abundantly evident, was necessary to make any provision, however excellent, of schools and teachers really operative in abiding educational results. As yet, in a word, the most truly destitute places had not been touched ; the children of the lowest strata had not been reached ; the selfishness of parents still remained the great obstacle in the way of the education of the children ; the landowners, farmers, and manufacturers, most bound to contribute to the work of educating their people, often contributed little or nothing ; the resources of voluntaryism had been taxed, in certain directions, until they could hardly be expected to yield much more. Much had been done ; a foundation had been laid for nearly all that needed to be accomplished ; but the great majority of the working classes were still growing up uneducated.

There was one really objectionable feature in the Privy Council system during all its tentative and preliminary stage with which Mr. Lowe in 1862 was too prudent to meddle. I refer to the principle of denominational inspection. At first this was a necessary concession to religious differences and jealousies. But it was, notwithstanding, in itself every way objectionable. It was a great waste of labour, sending an inspector driving across the country to find, often at considerable distances from each other, scattered British schools, Wesleyan schools, Roman Catholic schools. The Wesleyan denomina-

tion, to do them justice, never asked for, they indeed declined to have appointed, a denominational inspector of their own colour. But Church of England inspectors were all Anglican clergymen, British and Wesleyan inspectors were all laymen, Roman Catholic inspectors were Roman Catholics. This was, as I have said, waste of labour ; but it was also an administrative recognition, and a public emphasising, of the fact that denominational fears and distrusts asserted themselves even in secular examinations of schools and school children. So long, however, as the Government inspector in public elementary schools of the Church of England examined in religious knowledge it was inevitable that this system should continue. Only clergymen could so examine in Church of England schools, and the exclusive employment of clergymen as inspectors in such schools made it inevitable that other classes of schools should be visited by special and separate inspectors. For some years before 1870 there had been suggestions from various quarters that denominational inspection ought to be done away, and all schools, of whatever denomination, put together into districts defined purely by geographical considerations, and visited in each district by the same district inspector, without any more regard to his denomination than to that of the various schools. This feature of the Privy Council system was done away by the Act of 1870.

Some other features of our English system there are which bid fair to be permanent, and which collectively give a special character to our national system of elementary schools. To a description of these features I shall give the next short chapter.

NOTE, p. 320.

The grounds of the statement made in the text are exhibited in the following extract from an article on "Denominational and National Education," which I contributed to the *London Quarterly Review* (Elliot Stock), for January, 1870.

"Lord Robert Montagu, at Manchester, brought forward carefully prepared official statistics to prove that there are not more than 333,000 children in England who are not sent to school.* From the statistics which we print at the foot of this page,† and which have been drawn up from official sources by the Rev. G. W. Olver, the Secretary of the Wesleyan Education Committee, it would appear

---

* This really valuable address has been since published by Messrs. Longman and Co., under the title, "What is Education?"—See p. 13.

† Population of England and Wales, 1868—estimate corrected 21,732,866

Children between 5 and 13—1 in 6·21		3,499,656
In 1858—321,768 were receiving Superior Education		
Same proportion, 1868	358,000	
Children on Registers of Inspected and Aided Schools	1,438,872	
(Average attendance of Evening Scholars not included above—55,154)		1,702,744
Children to be accounted for		1,671,600
In Schools under Simple Inspection	35,987	
In Poor Law Board—Union and District Schools	39,850	
In Unaided Schools under Government Inspectors	75,837	
In Church Schools Uninspected by Government —returns 1866, simple Inspection	578,168	
Ragged School Union, in and around London (Day only)	33,260	
(Evening Scholars 15,239)		
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, actual number under 16,—R. 1,314; I. 1,456: estimated number between 10 and 13	1,290	
		688,555
Number of Children not in Public Schools		1,014,219
In Private Schools for Children of Poor in 1858 were 573,436; and supposing the same proportion is maintained, there would be in such Schools in 1868		638,107
Children not on any School Register		376,112

that there ought to be, according to the estimate of the Royal Commission, 3,499,656 children under education; that in superior and in State-aided public schools there are 1,796,872; in unaided inspected schools, in uninspected Church schools, in ragged schools, and reformatory and industrial schools, 688,555; in private schools for the children of the poor, 638,107; leaving a balance of 376,112 children not at school, of whom more than one-third are the children of paupers receiving out-door relief.

"In the figures furnished by Mr. Olver there is only one item which is liable to question. In 1858 there were, according to the returns obtained by the Royal Commission, 573,436 children of the poor in private schools. Mr. Olver, estimating for the increase of population in ten years, sets down the number for the present time as 638,107. We think it likely, however, that during the ten years, notwithstanding the check put upon the extension of public schools by the new code, a proportion of the private schools has been absorbed by public schools (inspected schools) set up in the same neighbourhood, and therefore that the proportion of children in private schools for the poor to the whole population may probably be less now than in 1858. If we allow for this consideration, 400,000 may be set down as the number of children not at school.

"Of these it is likely that a considerable proportion belong to the out-door pauper class, of whom it will be seen that there are 164,000 children, very few of them being sent to school. Others, no doubt, may be found in the small and remote villages in which there is no day-school; while another portion doubtless represents the Arab class of the streets. If there were an imperative, and not merely a permissive, enactment for sending the children of out-door paupers to school, it seems tolerably certain that the number of uneducated children would be reduced to about 250,000. But then the question will have to be asked, 'What sort of an education do many of the children receive whose names are on school registers of one class or other; and what is its worth and permanent result?'"

I may add that the Parliamentary grant for education in 1833 was £20,000; in 1840 was raised to £30,000; in 1850 was £180,110; in 1862 had risen to £774,743; in 1865, under the Revised Code, had fallen to £636,306; and in 1870 was £914,721. Last year (1872) it had risen, under the operation of the new Act, to £1,551,560. These figures represent the total grant for Great Britain.

There are in England and Wales 319,979 Pauper Children under 16; the proportion between 5 and 13 being . .	164,873
Number of known Thieves and suspected persons within the Metropolitan Police District under 16 years of age . .	983

No estimate, it will be seen, is attempted for the properly criminal juvenile population of England. The last item, referring only to the Metropolitan Police District, was furnished to Mr. Olver by Colonel Henderson. The City Returns since obtained will not bring the number up to 1,000.

The system of grants and inspection which was initiated in 1846-7 may be regarded as having been brought into full operation for England and Scotland, and for the various denominations, in its principles, methods and applications, about the year 1854 or 1855. In 1855 the Capitation Grant secured a numerical return of the children in average attendance. In 1855 the number of inspected schools was 4,800, and of scholars in average attendance, 537,585. In 1862 the numbers were 7,569 schools and 964,849 scholars. In 1870 the numbers were 10,949 and 1,453,531 respectively; in 1871 they were 11,465 and 1,866,009 respectively.* The number of children on the register may be reckoned at from 30 to 40 per cent. more than the number in average attendance. Between four-fifths and five-sixths of the number in attendance are English; the remainder Scotch.

---

* The admirable *Statesman's Year Book*, in its successive issues, contains very useful educational statistics.

CHAPTER VIII.

SPECIAL FEATURES IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SYSTEM OF ENGLAND—PUPIL-TEACHERS—FEMALE TEACHERS—INFANT-SCHOOLS.

MANY things may change in our English system of popular education. Grants of all sorts may be done away; all public Training Colleges, all public schools, including municipal schools or parochial schools, established out of the rates, may become self-supporting institutions; all parents, except those recognised as paupers or quasi-paupers, paying the full price of the schooling given to their children; in all these respects public education in England may be revolutionised. But it is hardly a risk to predict that, at least for a very long time to come, the pupil-teacher system must continue to rule in this country. It has been brought here to a degree of maturity and development elsewhere unknown; and it is pre-eminently adapted to the conditions of English society.

I have already described this system in general as one by which a scientific form and organization has been given to that provision of pupil aid in *schools of elementary instruction*, the need of which is

universally felt, and the rude and ready form of which, open to grave objection, and altogether imperfect and unsatisfactory, is found in the use of monitors, sometimes recognised and designated as such, and sometimes extemporised as necessity compels, and used without formal recognition. I have shown how much public elementary education in the United States, in Germany, and in France has suffered for the want of such an organization of pupil-teacher assistance, and how well a system identical in principle with that of England has worked in Holland and Switzerland. I need hardly add that the organization of pupil-teachers is one which, whilst eminently serviceable in elementary schools — advantageous equally to the school and to the pupil-teachers themselves who are being trained for their profession — would be altogether out of place in secondary schools —in schools for senior boys and for high instruction.

I will now proceed to sum up the reasons which seem to me to demonstrate the very great advantage of the pupil-teacher system over that of separate large classes and separate adult teachers, without any pupil-teacher aid, for schools of primary education. These advantages may be stated under five particulars. (1.) They secure to the chief teacher the needful aid in the most rudimentary work of instruction, so that all the children can be kept continually at work and in order, so that particular pains can be taken with those who are particularly slow or backward, and so that the chief teacher can bestow proper attention on the most important and difficult points of instruction, and can carry forward his most advanced scholars in propor-

tion to their age and capacity. For want of pupil-teachers all this is imperfectly performed, both in Germany and in France, notwithstanding the low salaries given in those countries to adult teachers. In this country, where wages of all sorts are so high, the case would be much worse than in Germany or in France, if the only teachers employed were adult teachers. In the United States, as we have seen, the want of a system of pupil-teachers in combination with an effective provision of Normal Colleges and of College training, tested by proper examinations, is the source of some of the worst evils complained of in the State Reports on Education. At present such a system is rendered impracticable by the prevalent character of the schools and of the school teachers in the States. (2.) I may venture to affirm that, even apart from any consideration of expense, or of the available supply of teaching power, the use of pupil-teachers in an elementary school, under special direction, and for certain sorts of very elementary instruction, is greatly to be desired. If an able teacher, in not too large a school, had to choose between the help of one adult assistant, and two capable and well-disposed pupil-teachers, I believe, in the great majority of cases, he would choose the pupil-teachers, and that he would choose rightly. He could more completely impress his own individuality on the school through their help than he could by the agency of an assistant. They are his apprentices; they have grown up in the school and are identified with it; they are still to continue in it till their apprenticeship is completed. He can have no such hold, nor can the school or the school committee have such a hold, of an assistant who, if he

can find a better place, will leave within the year, as of his pupil-teachers ; nor can his own mind and will, his spirit and methods, operate through the independent and perhaps rival individuality of his assistant, as they can through the pupil-teachers. An assistant-teacher, in fact, is only in place in a large school, and there it ought to be made worth his while to remain for a considerable period, side by side, and working in complete sympathy and harmony, with the chief teacher. It would be well, also, if such an assistant-teacher had himself the help continually of one or two pupil-teachers, all the staff, the while, working under the supreme sway of the will and individuality of the chief teacher. There is, moreover, one other point respecting the work of pupil-teachers to be borne in mind. It is an entire mistake to suppose that young people in their teens are not adapted to teach younger children. They are often, as to some points, the very best of teachers. Elder children, who clearly understand what is to be taught, have a wonderful homely, ready, simple, naïve way of teaching younger children. They have also, when really gifted for their work, a lightness, a pleasantness, a buoyancy—I had almost said a gaiety—and withal a cheery patience in their teaching, which make them invaluable in a schoolroom. (3.) Elementary school teachers, in this as in other countries, will, there can be no doubt, continue to be drawn largely, although not henceforth exclusively, from the families of thoughtful and superior working people, in the receipt of weekly wages. Now the pupil-teacher system, taking hold of the best and fittest children of this class at the age of thirteen or fourteen, and securing to them moderate remuneration

for their services at school, together with the continuance of their education under their school teachers, and a gradual preparation for the business of their lives, makes it possible to retain in the needful large proportion the services of the children of the class I have described. But how would it be if there were no pupil-teacher system? It would be absurd to expect that labouring people, as a rule, or in any large or adequate proportion, would forego, or allow their children to forego, the high weekly wages now to be realised by the employment of intelligent children, and would be at the further charge of keeping them still at school for five years together, until they were of an age to pass their examination and enter a training college. In the country districts of frugal Germany, where the peasants are all in a sort small farmers, where the labour-market does not compete for juvenile labour, where young people, faring hard and scantily at home, and clad yet, as in former centuries, in home-spun, may be content to spend the years of their youth partly in labour on the family acre, and partly in study, students may be provided for Normal Colleges without the pupil-teacher system. Or in France, where elementary education is largely in the hands of Roman Catholic fraternities and sisterhoods, the supply of teachers may be kept up without our system. But in England, if it were not for the pupil-teacher system, we should either have our Normal Colleges left without candidates, or such candidates would be derived, almost exclusively, from the families of clerks, of unwealthy clergymen, and the poorer professional men in general. (4.) Elementary education is, in large measure, an art; and requires, in order to success in its conduct, tact,

experience, and practised skill of a fine quality. The more supple the faculties, the more alert and youthful the energy, the more susceptible the sensibility, the more likelihood is there of superior teaching power. To such an art young people should be apprenticed early, if they are to be fully moulded to it; the earlier the better, if the knowledge and the physical strength and energy be adequate. What is youth for but to prepare for manhood? To omit the pupil-teacher apprenticeship from the total preparation of the future teacher would be to throw away the finest opportunity of laying the basis, in life's most plastic period, for all the professional training and life-work of the future. (5.) Finally, the pupil-teacher apprenticeship affords the opportunity of fully testing the aptitude of pupil-teachers for a life-work of teaching, before they take the decisive step of entering a Training College; while, in the case of those who, during their trial, prove not to be adapted for the work, the additional education and the training in habits of exactness and attention which they have received, will only make them better prepared for many other departments in the business and service of life.

At the same time it is proper and needful to say that the present age at which pupil-teachers are apprenticed is younger by at least one year than is desirable. It is, I believe, universally confessed that it would be better if they were apprenticed at fourteen than thirteen. The reasons for this are sufficiently obvious. The real reason why the apprenticeship has been allowed to begin at so early an age has been the lamentably low age at which children have been accustomed to leave school, and the demands—or

shall I say the temptations?—of the labour market. As a matter of fact, the age at which the children of the working classes have been taken from school has, during the last twenty years, on an average, gone backwards instead of forwards. Children have left school for labour at an age continually earlier. From twelve the age has gone down to eleven, from eleven it has descended towards ten. Many have left school at ten; few have stayed after eleven; very few indeed have remained till they were twelve. The new Act, however, cannot fail to make a considerable alteration in this respect. It recognises thirteen as the age up to which the education even of the children of the working classes should be carried. Moreover, the profession of teaching has greatly risen during the last few years, and is rising still. The payment of a good teacher is really much higher than of a fair ordinary clerk; the emoluments of a first-rate trained teacher are very handsome; and the way, besides, is opening for such teachers to obtain the position of school inspector, at least under School Boards, and to step upwards into the higher walks of the profession. Under these circumstances the thoughtful and superior class of parents, from whose families our pupil-teachers are derived, are likely to set a very high value on the prospects opened by the profession to their children. Parents of a higher social class, besides, are sure henceforth to look to the profession of public elementary teacher as one not only advantageous but honourable for their children to pursue; and, as the result of all this, a large and increasing number of parents will be prepared to make greater sacrifices for the sake of getting their children into the pathway of a calling so superior and so

desirable. They will be content, too, to keep them at school till fourteen, in order that at that age they may be apprenticed as teachers, and may enter on their apprenticeship better furnished and prepared for their work. I cannot but anticipate, accordingly, that after the present crushing demand for teachers has been got over, the age of the commencing pupil-teacher will be raised from thirteen to fourteen years. I confess that I should hail such a modification of the present system with great satisfaction. Taken in connection with the reduction in large schools of the number of pupil-teachers by the substitution of an assistant-teacher not less than eighteen years old for two of the pupil-teachers, as is to be the rule in another year, according to the present Government proposals, it will, I think, remove every objection to our English pupil-teacher system, and at the same time leave it substantially intact, as a source of interest and power in our schools, an admirable system of aid to the chief teacher, and the best possible method of training those who are to be teachers in after life in an intelligent comprehension of the science, and in the best practice of the art, of teaching and training.

There is another feature of our English system in which it excels all others, and that is the extensive employment of highly-trained female teachers—professional teachers—in our public schools. There is nothing like it in the world besides. In the United States female teachers are largely employed, because in such a country the extremely low salaries generally given to teachers will not attract the permanent services of competent men ; but the female teachers of America are seldom trained for their profession, and, as a rule,

only take up the work as a temporary interlude in life. In France female trained teachers are extensively employed, but these teachers are Roman Catholic *réligieuses*, separated from family and common life. In Germany, and throughout the Protestant countries of the Continent generally, women are seldom or never trained or employed as teachers; because, in fact, their recognised sphere, in all but the superior classes of society, is to drudge in menial toil, either within the house, or in the garden, or in the field. In educated Germany, whatever may be said of the respectability and superiority of the German village school teacher, that village teacher's sister is almost universally devoted to hard and coarse field labour, such as impresses upon her very early an appearance of servile and severe degradation, blots out every trace of refinement, and makes her, whilst still in middle life, appear prematurely old. As respects the refinements of domestic life, and all that belongs to the social position of woman, Germany might almost be regarded as a barbarous country compared with England. One evidence of this is seen in our female training colleges, and in the large store of female trained teachers, formed and disciplined by their training and their profession at once into refinement and self-reliance, who are to be found through out our country. Though our female teachers are none of them bound by any vow, many are so devoted to their profession that no light attraction will avail to detach them from it. Not a few have given, not a few will still give, a long course, it may be their adult lifetime, of active, happy service to their art and profession. None with such a profession in their hands will be likely to leave it except

for a superior home. A large class of women are moulded into character by this profession who are thoroughly able to hold a modestly independent course through life. They can afford to wait and decide for themselves as to their future by a deliberate choice. In any misfortune or trouble of life which may come upon them, in widowhood or sudden reverse of circumstances, the art they have made their own will, if health be but spared to them, still be a foundation under their feet. Embarked on the sea of life, they at least feel that even in shipwreck they can swim; or, I may say, that they have small crafts of their own, which they are competent to manage, and which, from their watertight soundness and their buoyancy, can scarcely sink in any sea. Nor is it only in respect of their profession that trained teachers have an advantage; they have an advantage also if they leave it, and in any other sphere to which they may be transferred. The culture and training they have received are of the utmost value in the family home, and scarcely of less value in the shop or in business. There is diffused, by means of the element of female trained teachers, throughout all the lower middle and working classes of our population an educative influence of a very superior, and at the same time very practical, character. In this country of ours, where our social refinement and superiority have made for us a difficulty much more felt than elsewhere, in the number of women who can scarcely, as in Germany, "dig," and who do not like either to starve or "beg," the opening for employment as public elementary teachers which is frankly and broadly offered must be recognised as of the very highest value. Young women

of the better educated classes, who desire to have a useful and independent mode of living, will find it immeasurably more happy and really respectable and properly independent than such positions as they have commonly sought in the past, whether as private governess, from the nursery-governess upwards, or as assistant in ordinary middle-class schools, or as companion to a lady. It is satisfactory to know that the employment of female teachers is likely to be more extensive in future than it has been hitherto. Not only will there, through the operation of the new Act, be of necessity a large immediate multiplication of girls' and infants' schools, but, to some extent, female teachers may not unlikely be employed in junior mixed schools, while in country villages, where there can be but one good school maintained for boys and girls and infants, it appears to be universally recognised that such a school ought to be under the charge of a female teacher. This is much better than in Germany, where all the schools and both sexes are taught by men, and where the infant-school system is only put in operation by voluntary charity or by private teachers.

In Germany the infant-school system is no part of public education. The school age there begins several years later than in this country. I cannot but regard that as a radical defect. It necessarily appertains to a scheme of education which excludes pupil-teachers and female teachers. In America, as I have already stated, infant-schools are little known. Our English infant-school system is one of our chief educational advantages. Having this, if we had but also a thoroughly settled and developed half-time system for children who have attained the age of ten,

and have passed the fourth standard of examination, there can be no doubt that in this country we should be able to meet the demands of the generation both in respect of elementary education and of the juvenile labour market.

CHAPTER IX.

THE RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTY.

IN 1862 Mr. Lowe left the religious difficulty apparently in a fair way to be solved. He had adopted a principle which Mr. Miall, the Parliamentary leader of the extreme voluntary party, had recommended, that Government should pay only for "secular results" in education, as tested by Government examinations. At first, it seemed as if on this basis the bitterness of sectarian prejudice and animosity in regard to national education would be got over. There was, indeed, one condition with which all Government help was tied, that might seem somewhat to conflict with the simplicity and satisfactoriness of this principle, as a means of extricating the Government, to the eye of a secularist, from all responsibility for religious teaching in the schools. I refer to the condition that, in all besides Roman Catholic schools, the Bible must be read; but if this compulsory requirement could be done away, it appeared as if all that a secularist could demand would be conceded, at least in respect to this main point of direct Government responsibility for religious teaching.

There were, indeed, some other matters of detail in

which the existing system of State aid to voluntary schools seemed to lend itself to the public countenance and perpetuation of ecclesiastical distinctions and differences. There was the principle of denominational inspection of which I have already spoken. Public opinion, however, was evidently prepared to support any Government in changing this principle for one of undenominational and merely district inspection, inspection of all schools according to their geographical position and relations, district by district. Such a change would involve the requirement that the Established Church, like the Roman Catholics or the Wesleyans, should make special ecclesiastical arrangements for the inspection or examination of its schools and pupil-teachers in religious knowledge, and should admit lay inspectors to visit its schools. But as to this no serious difficulty could be apprehended in any permanent and national settlement of the question. There was, furthermore, the fact that in a large number of State-aided and inspected schools of the Church of England, it was required not only by the rules of the National Society, but by the trust-deeds of the schools, that all who attended the schools should receive specific denominational instruction in religion, and in particular in the Church catechism, and should attend the church on the Lord's day. Government had earnestly and perseveringly sought in 1847 and 1848 to induce the authorities of the Church of England and of the National Society to relax the stringency of their requirements as to this point, and to adopt for all their schools a Conscience Clause similar to that which had been, for years previously, voluntarily adopted by the Wesleyan Conference in regard to

their schools; but the Church of England could not be brought to make any change in the rules and the legal provisions which, not without strong apparent reason and justification at the time, had been adopted nearly forty years before. At that time the National Society was a purely voluntary association, established for purposes predominantly, if not purely, religious, without any thought of Government inspection or concurrence or pecuniary aid; and the feeling of Nonconformist rights and rivalry was scarcely an appreciable force in the country, had little hold on public opinion, and was not at all represented in Parliament; at that time, indeed, besides Church people, multitudes of Wesleyan Methodists regarded the instruction of their children in the Church catechism and attendance at morning church as consistent with their own religious and ecclesiastical position. This was the case, although they were members of a Connexion standing aside from the Church. But a revolution had gradually been established in public opinion during the period which elapsed between the foundation of the National Society in 1811 and the initiation of the system of State co-operation with the various Churches of England in 1846-50. It was the misfortune of the Church of England not to have recognised the fact of this revolution. Hence arose one of the difficulties of detail connected with the system of State co-operation, which remained standing in the way until the enactment of the measure of 1870. Doubtless the difficulty was often more theoretical than practical. It was more frequently the uninspected than the inspected National School in which undue influence was used in regard to the Wesleyan or Dissenting

child. Where money was received from Government, and the Government inspector visited the school, the management of the school was often more liberal. An honest sense of equity, of public responsibility, of common civic rights, often restrained the clergyman who managed the school from acting on the letter of the National Society's rules and of the school trust-deeds. But it could not be expected that Nonconformists should discriminate between the State-aided and the independent and purely voluntary National School. In their view all Church of England schools were equally public schools, belonging to the parishes, connected with the State, and bound, as no other denominational schools could be bound, to respect the civil and religious rights and the conscientious convictions of the parents. Hence the feeling engendered by the known refusal of the Church authorities to allow a Conscience Clause, taken in connection with repeated complaints, in all the purely agricultural parts of the country, of the enforcement on the Nonconformist's child, attending the National School, of absence from its own Sunday-school and from its parents' chapel, and of attendance at the church and the church Sunday-school, was very deep and bitter, and continued to accumulate during a whole generation before the passing of the Elementary Education Act of 1870.

It is remarkable that it was the form of the religious grievance which I have just described, rather than the requirement that all the scholars must learn the Church catechism, which was felt by Nonconformists to be the special hardship in the case. Dissenting children learnt about being "made a child of God in baptism," as about "godfathers and god-

mothers," merely as an exercise of memory. They could not but feel that what they were learning by rote was, so far as they were concerned, simply unreal; that it stood in no relation whatever to the facts of their life and position; and, although they knew they were expected to learn it, they were sure they could not be expected to believe it, and so the whole catechismal rote was to them a matter of mere repetition, only redeemed from utter unmeaningness and unprofitableness by the questions relating to God and their neighbour. But to be kept from their own and their parents' Sunday-school and chapel on the Sunday, and to be obliged to go to church, was an oppression which pierced deep into the heart.

Neither was the practical Dissenting grievance often connected with the personal lessons and instructions, even on religious subjects, given in the day-schools by the teacher or by the clergyman. I at least have scarcely ever heard of an instance of any complaint on such a ground, although it has been my official duty in my own church to make extensive inquiry, and to receive information relating to such subjects from wide districts. National schoolmasters themselves have very rarely taught sacramental mysticism or ecclesiastical superstition. Their teaching has been plain and practical, for the most part simply Scriptural. What the clergyman taught was comparatively of much less consequence. Children under ten or eleven are not very receptive of such doctrines as those which are often taught respecting baptismal regeneration, the real presence, and, in a word, the "extensions of the Incarnation." Not one clergyman, moreover, in a hundred has acquired the difficult art of so address-

ing a gallery of children as to engage their interest and impress and convey real ideas into their mind. Nor have the children of Nonconformists generally any innate or acquired reverence for the clergyman or his teaching, even although he should wear his surplice in his school. A few lessons of the doctrine of their own chapel or meeting-house, and the air of their own Sunday-school, will quite take the taste of all the Church teaching out of their mouths, and leave them, with their parents, implicitly convinced that the clergyman, however good and kind a gentleman, is in a sadly benighted condition as to what constitutes sound doctrine. Hence the grievance was the greater when the children were kept from their own Sunday-school and meeting-house.

It appears to have been the custom of the clergy of the Church of England to ignore this specific form of Dissenting complaint. They seem to have made it almost a general rule to assume that to take to church on Sunday those whom they instructed on the week-day was a plain right that no one could dispute. They have assumed that the only complaints possible must relate to the matter or manner of religious instruction during the week. They have sailed aloft in entire unconsciousness that the real grievance, at all events the great grievance, related to the Sunday. Hence they have been able to declare that they had heard of no complaints, or of scarcely any, in regard to the teaching imparted in their schools. "No Dissenters offered any objection to anything they taught; they forced no catechism or religious instruction on parents or children; there were no cases of oppression; even inspectors met with none, heard

of none." But inspectors were the last people likely to hear of such complaints; complaints which had nothing to do with the week-day teaching in the school, but only with the requirement that children attending the day-school must also attend Sunday-school and church. If the oppressed parents had only dared to appeal to the press; if the Church of England laity at large, much more the general laity of the country, had only been aware of the policy systematically pursued in many parishes, this form of spiritual tyranny would have been long ago put down by public indignation. That this policy was pursued to far too wide an extent, and with decisive results in arousing indignation and producing bitter alienation from the Church of England on the part of Wesleyan Methodists throughout all the predominantly agricultural parts of the country, may be learnt from an article on "Mr. Forster's Educational Bill" in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1870. I am sorry to have been obliged to give so much space to the subject in this volume.

It must be admitted, however, that the chief blame in this matter must rest not with the parish clergy, but with the authorities of the National Society. So long as the rules of that Society remained unaltered, and as the trust-deeds of National Schools continued to be drawn on the ancient model, parish clergymen were placed in a very painful dilemma. They were obliged, in a large number of instances, either to break the rules of the Society with which they were identified, and to violate the provisions of their trust-deeds, or to compel their day scholars to attend their church and Sunday-school.

It was, I venture to think, a weakness and an

error on the part of the Government in 1847-8, that they yielded to the obstinate immobility of the National Society on the Conscience Clause; but it was a far greater error, on the part of that Society, as representing the Church of England, that it persistently withstood the arguments and solicitations of the Government. As a matter of course, the Roman Catholic Church followed their precedent. The Wesleyans, prior to any transaction with the Government, had in the trust-deeds of their day-schools, and in their Connexional Day-school Rules and Regulations, fully recognised the rights of conscience. Many Wesleyans, in hasty but not unnatural indignation at the course pursued by the Church of England, which owns nearly three-fourths of the public elementary schools of the country, have come now to swell the number of those who demand the withdrawal of all Government connection with denominational schools.

Notwithstanding all this, however, this question of the Conscience Clause and of the rights of religious liberty for parents and children, was not, as respects the Government, any serious difficulty in the way of permanent legislation. The principle of the Government, whatever party was in power, and of the leading statesmen of all parties, has always been to have a Conscience Clause. It was certain that, whenever a Government measure was carried for consolidating and regulating public elementary schools, a Conscience Clause would be insisted upon, in any such measure, as a condition of obtaining recognition as a public elementary school.

With payment for secular results only, with undenominational inspection, with a broad and trenchant

Conscience Clause, as three main planks in its settlement of the religious difficulty, it might have been thought that no Government would find any serious difficulty on this score. The extreme secularist party, however, have, during the last three years, shaped and expounded "the religious difficulty" into forms which had not before been anticipated.

The "religious difficulty," as it was understood previously to 1869, referred to the religious rights of parents in regard to their children, whether as respected education or worship. The new phase of the religious difficulty which has grown up during the last three or four years, relates to the rights of conscience of ratepayers, as respects the employment of money contributed by them to the taxes or rates.

The only point as to the rights of the parental conscience which remains in question since the passing of Mr. Forster's Act, is one connected with the efficiency and enforceableness of the Conscience Clause. The Conscience Clause of the Act, indeed, is very stringent and comprehensive. It deals both with the question of religious instruction in the schoolroom, and with the question of influence being used to constrain the day scholars in regard to school and worship on Sunday. But there are some persons, notwithstanding, who insist that no Conscience Clause will ever prove to be of any working value, that it will be evaded by the clergyman, or that the parents will be afraid to act upon it; and, therefore, that the only way to escape all danger of interference with parental rights of conscience is to have purely secular schools, where no Conscience Clause would be required.

It would be an easy and obvious reply to this

allegation to say that the establishment of a secular school would do violence to the consciences of far more parents than it would relieve, and of a great majority, almost everywhere, of the ratepayers, as such. That this is so had been conclusively shown by the School Board elections during the last three years. But there are some other considerations which it is proper to urge in reply.

The establishment of secular schools everywhere would not annul existing schools. Nor, I apprehend, would it seriously diminish the number in attendance upon them. It would afford a means of silencing objectors against clerical influence or Church teaching by pointing to the secular school provided. It would place objecting parents in the painful dilemma of acquiescing in the management or influence to which they had objected, or of sending their children where no Christian teaching was given. Few would choose the latter alternative. Even if Government grants were withdrawn from the schools of the Church of England—which will hardly take place until Government grants are withdrawn from all public elementary schools equally, whether voluntary or Board schools—the effect in the great majority of cases would not be to do away with the Church school, but only to reduce it to a school of inferior appointments and probably inferior teaching, without any Government inspection to make known its inferiority, and without any force either of law (as by the Conscience Clause) or of public opinion to oblige it to be liberal in its administration. Such a result, however, as the universal establishment of secular schools cannot be regarded as within any range of probability, much

less can any such double result be supposed to be possible as the universal establishment of such schools and at the same time the withdrawal of grants from all other schools.

But I am persuaded that the assumption that the Conscience Clause will, to any serious extent, be evaded by the managers of Church of England schools, is equally uncharitable and unwarrantable. The clergy of the Church of England, for the most part, are at least honourable men, English gentlemen. It is continually forgotten by disputants of a heated, sectarian, anti-Anglican temper, that, up to the passing of the recent Act, there was, with rare exceptions, no Conscience Clause in any sense binding upon day-schools of the Church of England; that, where there was, it was merely a clause somewhere to be found, if searched for, in a voluminous trust-deed, not ordinarily at hand for any one to be acquainted with; and that the Government grant was in no way dependent, in any case, on the observance of the Conscience Clause; while, on the other hand, the deeds of many National Schools, and the rules of all, made it a duty incumbent on the clergyman to enforce, at least as an ordinary condition of attendance at the day-school, that the scholar should attend church on the Sunday. The really liberal clergyman, in making exceptions and remissions in the case of Nonconformist children, had often a question to settle with his own conscience, how far he had a right to dispense with the requirements of the National Society's rules and his own trust-deeds. But now the Act of 1870 overrides all these considerations. The annual grant, moreover, is made conditional on the observance of the Conscience

Clause. Thus the truly liberal clergyman is now free, while the intolerant clergyman receiving a grant is now bound, to respect the religious convictions of the parents and the children.

The Act has, in fact, reversed the conditions under which thousands of schools previously worked, and has brought the eye of public opinion and the vigilance of Government inspection to bear upon the school administration. It prohibits and makes punishable, by a crippling fine, that is, by the absolute withdrawal of Government aid, all cases of the infraction of conscience, and appoints a strict and experienced staff of inspectors to take cognisance of all such cases. There will of course remain means of sectarian influence which would find their way into any sort of school, and which no Parliamentary enactment could provide against. Sectarian tactics may, now and then, be made use of, in obscure villages, against which no Government measure and no statutory educational provision could afford a defence. Nothing can be done to meet such cases of small and cunning contrivance, of petty bigotry, except drag them into daylight, that those who perpetrate them may be exposed in the pillory of public notoriety.

No sort of Conscience Clause, it must be admitted —no educational measure whatever, it must be added —can avail of itself, or all at once, to infuse manliness and a worthily independent spirit into the semi-pauper, serf-like sons of the soil. In spite of all that any Act of Parliament can do, many of these will still cringe to squire and parson, however much they may dislike Church or Church Catechism. Set them upright on their legs, and they will still go

down on their knees when the living representatives of Church and State—whether as in constitutional union, or not—the representatives of territorial power and administrative influence and of religious office and antiquity—come within their view. Instruct them in their rights, and make their rights equally secure and plain; they will, notwithstanding, go out of their way to offer up their rights and their allegiance to those in power and high position near them. What is to cure this? Certainly not a secular school. Among such a population, rates for a secular school could hardly be levied; and if such a school were set up, it would remain empty, even though it were a free school, while the children of such parents would be sent to the school of the parson and the squire. To do away with the cringing subserviency complained of something is needed, which no mere educational measure can supply. The relations of the labouring people to cottage and land need to be revolutionised, the pauper condition to be redeemed, and the pauper prospect to be moved away, before the abject spirit can be taken out.

Not, indeed, that the Conscience Clause will be quite powerless even in such cases. It is by law made public in large and conspicuous printing in every inspected school; the poor man's child sees it there, and practises upon it his power to read; the poor man knows that it is there as the charter of his religious rights; the poor man's minister can appeal to the law and to the printed and public announcement of it; the parish clergyman fully understands that the Government grant which he seeks is expressly suspended, as an absolute and universal condition, on his strict and full observance of this rule, and that his

honour and conscience bind him, and public opinion as well as public law requires him, to keep it. It is idle, such being the case—it is an extreme instance of bigoted antipathy and prejudice—to pretend that the Conscience Clause will be a dead letter. I have no doubt it will be honourably observed by clergymen generally, and that it will be an element of value and potency in educating the sons of English soil as to their civil and religious rights.

The advocates of secularism in State education, however, rely quite as much on the other branch of their argument as on that with which I have now been dealing. They contend that the ratepayers' rights of conscience can only be preserved sacred by a universal State system of secular education. Unfortunately, however—here again—for their plea and contention, the ratepayers, when asked to speak for themselves, reply, all over the kingdom, by overwhelming majorities, that what their consciences especially revolt against is precisely that system of universal secular education which secularists would prescribe for the comfort and protection of their consciences.

It must be admitted, notwithstanding, that, if the State is to interfere at all directly in the matter of popular education, its own function and responsibility should certainly be limited to that which is unsectarian, and, if it were possible, would most conveniently be limited to that which is secular, in instruction and results. Here I find myself, in principle, pretty well agreed with the secularists. It is when they would forbid the co-operation of Christian organizations and of Christian teaching, otherwise provided, with the functions and work of the State in

popular education, that, in common with most others, I am obliged to differ. As to what is positive, I would go with them a long way, although I am not prepared to admit that it is necessarily wrong, or any violation of the rights of conscience, for public money to be ever directly devoted to Christian education in an unsectarian sense, to unsectarianly religious popular education. But I must entirely differ from their negative and prohibitory conclusions, when they insist that the State is to provide a barely and exclusively secular system of national education, which shall be held separate and aloof from all union or blending of Christian instruction and religious training and influence.

The present system of State co-operation with voluntary schools proceeds, in fact, as is expressly set forth in the Elementary Education Act, on a strictly secular principle. The grants of the Privy Council are made expressly and exclusively in consideration of the secular results of instruction. This, and this alone, is what the State pays for, in the case of such schools. The whole action of the State in these schools is limited to the appraising and rewarding of "secular results." In consideration of these, the State now contributes, on an average, about two-fifths of the annual cost of the education given in such schools. The schools, it must be remembered, have been established by their voluntary managers, and, on an average, very nearly one-third of the cost is provided by the managers, the remainder—nearly a third more—being provided by the school fees.

Of course the schools which thus do the State's work receive an advantage from the State's contribution. But this is not a fair objection against the

system. Doubtless, the Roman Catholic community receives an indirect benefit when a Government contract is given to a Roman Catholic. If this objection is pressed, it must take effect far and wide. Suppose that, in a Baptist school, uninspected, and therefore without any Government grant—a free and independent Baptist school—advantage is taken, as I have reason to believe that advantage has been taken in some large and admirable elementary schools of that denomination, of the examinations under the Science and Art Department to have well-prepared scholars examined in drawing, geometry, and other such subjects, and that, in consequence, grants have been earned at the rate of 3*s.* per successful child, besides prizes for the children ; is all this to be stigmatized and disallowed as concurrent endowment ? Observe, in these cases there is no Conscience Clause ; the religious teaching is thoroughly denominational, and its spirit pervades the whole of the instruction through all the hours. The money earned in these cases goes to help the funds and to promote the reputation and prosperity of most thoroughly and intensely denominational institutions, of schools which have no properly public character whatever. Yet I never heard an objection raised to such schools, or to any schools, sending in scholars to pass the examinations and to earn the grants of the Science and Art Department. This is done continually. Nobody would dream of denouncing it. How inconsistent then to denounce the principle of procedure embodied in the Education Act, so far as respects grants to voluntary schools ! Surely reading, writing, and arithmetic are as strictly secular results as drawing and geometry. The voluntary schools, more-

over, are really public schools, inspected by Government under a Conscience Clause, and teaching nothing at all but secular instruction, except at one fixed hour per day. If a Baptist uninspected school may earn from the Science and Art Department grants per child on examination, it is a clear *à fortiori* argument that public elementary schools, although under voluntary management, that inspected schools, working under a Conscience Clause, may rightfully earn grants on examination for "secular results."

What, indeed, is the difference in principle between the arrangement sanctioned in the recent Act, which limits religious instruction strictly to a certain time, before or after the ordinary school hours, and the principle which secularists themselves, constrained by the hard facts of the case and by the claims of Christianity—by the religious necessities of the children—have now, it would seem, agreed to support, viz. that religious instruction may be given in the schoolroom to the children at appointed and convenient times by the accepted religious teachers of their own denomination? After this concession the only difference of principle left is the point of proscription as contended for by the secularists. They would proscribe and disable the lay teacher—the man ordinarily best qualified, and whose Christian teaching would be every way most influential and beneficial as an element in the total education of the children—from taking any part in the Christian instruction of the children under his care! That they can finally persevere in the maintenance of a principle so illiberal, in the advocacy of such a disability and proscription, levelled against lay teaching of morals and religion, against the exercise by the ordinary teacher of the

highest power for discipline, for influence, for all that is good, which a teacher can have, seems to me to be incredible. Such a proposition from an Ultramontane quarter might not have been surprising. Coming from "advanced Liberals" it is altogether astonishing.

It appears to me, accordingly, that so far as the direct interference of the general Government, the central administration of the nation, with the matter of popular education is concerned, the question of religious instruction ought to be solved on this principle. It combines the convenience of the merely secular principle in extricating the Government from all entanglement with controverted doctrines or particular sects, with the advantage of practically allowing religious instruction and influence to be, through the concurrence of voluntary agency, combined with general instruction.

Another principle, however, has ruled, thus far, in regard to School Board education — education, that is, as provided by local rates, in municipalities and parishes, and as managed and administered by locally-elected boards. In the great majority of these cases, the principle adopted has been that of unsectarian Christian education in the schools—the unsectarian religious instruction, like the religious instruction in the voluntary schools, being given at a fixed period preceding or following the ordinary and statutable school hours, and under the regulations of a Conscience Clause. Of course this arrangement lies distinctly open to the objection, whatever force there may be in it, that it is an employment of public money, in fact of local rates, distinctly and expressly for the purpose of religious instruction. The instruction, indeed, is called "unsectarian;" but to a Roman

Catholic it is sectarian, being a form of generically Protestant instruction out of the Scriptures. So also to the Deist, the Rationalist, the "advanced Liberal" Unitarian Christian, it is a form of sectarian and dogmatic instruction, opposed to his "conscientious convictions." So far as the instruction goes, it is a broad Protestant form of Biblical Christianity, and favours certain Christian sects in common, to the exclusion of other religious communities, professedly Christian, or, perhaps also, professedly non-Christian. This is a difficulty which, in the case of School Board schools, could not be avoided, except by falling into the other and greater difficulty of setting up absolutely secular schools for the training and instruction of the most neglected and degraded classes. The solution possible in the case of voluntary schools is not possible or compatible in the case of these schools.

It is obvious that such Board schools as these are opposed in principle to the rigid theory of separation between Church and State. This is a question for Radical and thorough-going anti-State-Churchmen, who are in favour of Bible instruction in Board schools, to settle on their own account. Let them, at the same time, ask themselves how they can bring themselves to allow the appointment of chaplains to regiments and to vessels of war.

It is remarkable, I may here note, that, in the School Boards generally, no objection appears to have been raised even by extreme anti-State-Church secularists to voting large moneys continually in support of industrial schools, all of which are on a distinctly religious basis, and of which a considerable number are Roman Catholic.

To me it seems that the principle which maintains that nothing can be done or provided by Act of Parliament, or by the will of any majority, however overwhelming, which infringes on what any man holds as his conscientious convictions, or which requires him to contribute towards the teaching of anything which he religiously disapproves or conscientiously rejects as false and of evil tendency, is a principle simply incompatible with national integrity or any form of government. The Mormon professes to hold conscientious and religious convictions in antagonism with the morality recognised by our public law in this country. Besides which, even "secular instruction" is certain to include much which, by implication if not directly, is opposed to the religious opinions, which must stand at least for religious convictions, of many ratepayers, while the crude and untrue scientific teachings of many teachers will impinge as painfully against the conscientious convictions of our "scientists," to whom science is religion, as any headlong or erroneous religious dogmatism against the religious convictions of certain ratepayers. For my part, I do not see why a man of science may not as "conscientiously" object to have to contribute any quota of rates for the teaching of false science as a secularist in religion for the teaching of religious dogmas.

In these matters the average want and claim of the great majority must be held to decide what ought to be done. When an objector has done his best, as a citizen, to influence this decision, he ought to have satisfied his conscience. There must, after all, be government. No abstract principle is sound which, in the concrete, proves to be quite impracticable.

What men take to be an abstract principle is often a working prejudice founded upon limited and ill-interpreted experience—a shell of words in which some principle is embodied which those who use the words have not learnt truly to abstract and define.

CHAPTER X.

RECENT LEGISLATION FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

IT was evident for several years before 1870 that the question of National Education for England must soon be dealt with on a comprehensive scale. This was indeed a foregone conclusion from the time that the Democratic Reform Bill (1867) was passed by the Tory Government. Mr. Lowe had in 1861-2 proposed by his Revised Code to deal out education to the people as a pauper dole. But the new Reform Bill led him to declare that one of the first and most pressing duties of the new Parliament would be to teach their new "masters their letters." The Duke of Marlborough, as a member of Mr. Disraeli's Government, had brought in a bill in 1868 for the settlement and extension of public elementary education, but it was inadequate to meet the necessities of the case—it went, indeed, almost wholly upon the old foundations—and the Tory Government were in no position to carry it through. When, in 1868-9, the Liberal Government acceded to office, and Mr. Forster became Vice-President of the Council, it was understood from the first that a measure for extending and consolidating national education must come

to the front. Such a measure was announced as to be brought forward in the Queen's Speech for 1870, and Mr. Forster, Dr. Arnold's son-in-law, the brother-in-law of Mr. Matthew Arnold, the Educational Inspector and Commissioner, himself also one who had taken a very thorough and deep interest in popular education for years, who had often spoken on the subject in Parliament, who was a practical manager of elementary day-schools, and had, along with Mr. Bruce and Mr. Egerton, brought forward an Education Bill of acknowledged merit in the House of Commons two or three years before, was very distinctly marked out as specially fitted, as Vice-President of the Council, to undertake the question.

Accordingly, on the 17th of February, 1870, Mr. Forster moved for and obtained leave to bring in the Government Elementary Education Bill, and, in so doing, explained the general principles of the measure. Of the scope and chief provisions of the Bill I shall soon speak particularly. Here I need only remark, to explain what immediately follows, that one provision of the Bill was that, to whatever extent a final deficiency of school accommodation should be ascertained in any district, that deficiency should be met by means of schools to be founded, and in part sustained, by local rates, and that the local authorities—the local School Board which, in all such cases, was to be created—should be left to decide what should be the religious complexion of such schools, and how the religious instruction, if any, should be imparted in them. On the 14th of March he moved the second reading of the Bill. At this stage, Mr. Dixon, the chairman and Parliamentary representative of the Birmingham League for the promotion of secular,

free, and compulsory education, moved an amendment to the effect that no measure could be satisfactory which left the question of religious instruction in schools supported out of national funds and local rates to be determined by local authorities. There had been three nights' discussion on asking leave to bring in the Bill, and there were again three nights' discussion on the second reading, but Mr. Dixon withdrew his amendment after the discussion, and the second reading passed without a division. Three months now elapsed during which the Bill made no progress, owing to the way being blocked by the Irish Land Bill. That measure, however, having passed, the Committee on the Education Bill was taken on the 16th June. The Prime Minister on that occasion announced several important changes which Government proposed to make in the Bill—changes so important that it was agreed, after some discussion, that the Bill should be reprinted and re-committeed. The modified Bill was, accordingly, brought forward again in Committee four days later (June 20), and was discussed for four long nights. On this occasion Mr. Dixon, as representing the Birmingham League, retired in favour of Mr. H. Richard. Mr. Richard, seconded by Sir Charles Dilke, moved a resolution to the effect that "the existing denominational schools should not be increased;" that attendance ought to be made everywhere compulsory, and that religious instruction ought to be supplied by voluntary effort and not out of public funds. To the last point it was replied in effect that in denominational schools the religious instruction was not and would not be supplied out of public funds, that the public funds were contributed, as expressly stated in the Bill

itself, only as payment for secular instruction. Mr. Richard's motion was lost by a majority of 361, the votes in its favour numbering 60. The Bill was pressed so diligently forward that, notwithstanding the innumerable amendments of which notice had been given, it passed through Committee in a month, and on the day after the Committee's work was ended its third reading in the Commons was taken (July 22nd). On the same day it was read a first time in the House of Lords; it was read a second time on the 25th; it entered and passed through Committee in the House of Lords on the 29th; the amendments were reported on the 1st of August, and the third reading taken on the 2nd. On the 4th the Lords' amendments were reported to the Commons, and, for the most part, agreed to. On the 8th the Commons' disagreement from certain amendments was reported to the Lords, and admitted by their lordships, the same being reported to the Commons the next day. On the same day (August 9) the Royal Assent was given to the Bill, and it became an Act and Statute of Parliament. The only amendment of any importance made by their lordships was the disallowance of the election of School Boards by ballot except in London.*

The new Act retained existing inspected schools, but it made a time-table Conscience Clause imperative in all schools in which religious instruction was given; it also did away with all denominational classifications of schools and with denominational inspection, treating all inspected schools as equally belonging to a national system of schools and under

* The principal provisions of the Act are given in Appendix A at the end of this volume.

national inspection, the distinctions as to inspectors and their provinces being henceforth purely geographical. But the new Act no longer required that public elementary schools established by voluntary agency and under voluntary management should have in them any religious character or element whatever, whether as belonging to a Christian church or denomination, or as connected with a Christian philanthropic society, or as providing for the reading of the Scriptures in the school. It was left open to any party or any person to establish purely voluntary schools if they thought fit. But, furthermore, the Act made provision for an entirely new class of schools, to be established and (in part) supported out of local rates, to be governed by locally-elected School Boards, and to have just such and so much religious instruction given in them as the governing boards might think proper, at times preceding or following the prescribed secular school hours, and under the protection of a time-table Conscience Clause, as in the case of voluntary schools, with this restriction only, that in these schools no catechism or denominational religious formulary of any sort was to be taught. The mode of electing members to the School Boards was to be by what is called the cumulative vote—that is, each elector was to have as many votes as there were candidates, and these votes he could give all to one, or else distribute among the candidates as he liked ; and all ratepayers were to be electors.

The original draft of the Bill did not contain the restriction as to School Board schools, which forbids denominational standards or formularies to be taught in them. Moreover it allowed School Boards to engage and use voluntary schools as their own

schools, on conditions to be agreed upon with the managers of those schools, the management, however, being still left, as before, with those who had established the schools. The Nonconformists generally, however—all but universally—insisted that, in case School Boards employed, and *pro tanto* adopted, such schools, all denominational formularies should be excluded from them. Modifications in regard to the two points I have now mentioned were announced by Mr. Gladstone in the speech in which he moved the second reading of the Bill. He stated that the Government would agree to disallow denominational formularies in Board schools, and would do away with the provision enabling Boards to employ and aid with rates denominational schools. The new law thus made a clear separation, in one respect, between voluntary and Board schools. Both were to stand equally in relation to the National Education Department, under the Privy Council; but the voluntary schools were to have nothing to do with local rates or rate aid, nor Local Boards to have any control over voluntary schools. In connection with this the Prime Minister announced that there would be an increase in the Privy Council grants to schools, "within a maximum of fifty per cent." That, however, was a misleading statement. The new rates of grant per child in average attendance, or per child who passes the inspector's examination, increased apparently by fifty per cent., are connected with new and very much more stringent conditions, as to the number of times a child examined must have attended school, and as to the attainments which are to earn a grant.* The school regulations,

* See Appendix B, which gives the chief provisions of the New Code.

also, as to teaching staff, are made more exacting and expensive. Moreover, whatever may be nominally earned by the examination in any school, more is not to be paid than 15*s.* per child in average attendance, or than one-half of the total cost of the school's maintenance for the year, the excess above either of these limits being forfeited. Now the average earned under the former dispensation amounted to nearly 10*s.* a scholar in attendance, whereas the maximum which under any conditions can now be paid in the best school is not to exceed 15*s.* That is to say, the possible *maximum* under the present dispensation is fifty per cent. above, not the maximum, but the *average*, under the former. As a matter of fact, many good schools under the former conditions earned a grant of 13*s.*, 14*s.*, even 15*s.* per scholar in average attendance, and now they cannot possibly be paid more than 15*s.* Twenty shillings may be, and I believe occasionally are, nominally earned; but not more than 15*s.* can be paid. The actual increase of grant under the new Act has been about twenty per cent.—from an average of 10*s.* to an average of 12*s.*; it may perhaps in some years to come reach twenty-five per cent. No one can read Mr. Gladstone's speech, delivered on the second reading of the Bill, without seeing that he was not at all clear in his own understanding of the case. He promised that the grants should be raised from the amount of one-third of the average cost of a year's education for a child to a possible maximum of one half, that is from 10*s.* to possibly 15*s.*; but he did not understand that the 10*s.* average in past administration and former grants involved already a possible maximum of 15*s.*, and that, in fact, his possible

maximum was not raised by a penny, 15*s.*, or one-half of the annual expense, having been the double limitation of grants under the former Code no less than under the new Act and Code. Mr. Gladstone's misconception on this point was peculiarly unfortunate, because no one feature in the new Act has excited greater hostility than the supposed increase of Privy Council grants by fifty per cent. The actual increase, as I have stated, has been about twenty per cent.

In connection with these changes, Mr. Gladstone also stated that building grants were for the future to be done away. This was a very considerable change and a very proper one. To contribute State money towards the erection of school-buildings entirely under the management of denominations, and indeed their permanent property, on the sole condition that, if the school were sold, payment should be made to Government of the money originally contributed, or so much of it as might be demanded, was too much like a real endowment of the denominations with property for ordinary persons to be able to discern the difference, especially as the special condition, in the case of sale, would, of course, only be known to few, to hardly any beyond the trustees or managers. The Wesleyan Methodists, however, were the only party to urge this point on the Government.

As this matter of the cessation of building grants is in itself important, and particularly as the most extraordinary misrepresentations in relation to it have been extensively current, it will be proper to give exact and full explanations respecting it. The proposal to bring building grants to an end emanated,

as I have said, from the Wesleyan Methodists. A deputation officially representing that body of Christians had an interview with Mr. Gladstone on May 25th, 1870, and presented resolutions urging a number of changes in the Bill then before Parliament, of which several were of a somewhat trenchant character, and one of which went to the abolition of Building Grants. The deputation was headed by the Rev. Dr. Jobson, then President of the Wesleyan Conference. I was myself also present, and was called upon to explain the views of the deputation as to the detailed alterations or modifications which they desired to press on the Government. In so doing I used the following words, in relation to the abolition of building grants, as urged by the deputation :—

"It was also the conviction of the Wesleyan Committee that building grants from the Government to denominational schools ought immediately to come to an end. By discontinuing grants to aid in building denominational schoolrooms, the objection on the ground of concurrent endowment would be largely met. The function of the Government would be reduced and limited to that of testing, and appraising, and rewarding the purely secular results of education. They were further of opinion that no school which did not to the fullest extent accept a Conscience Clause should be counted, or should have any standing at all as an elementary school, in the preliminary census or inquiry as to school provision under the Bill. . . . They were all agreed that the permissive faculty of inspection under the Bill should be done away. *By such changes as had been indicated, the relation of the Government to the existing schools*

would be separated from all cognisance of their denominational character."*

It is remarkable that, as we have seen, until the Methodists urged their objection to the continuance of building grants, no whisper of any suggestion had been heard in any quarter for doing away with them. Among the innumerable amendments announced, no amendment to this effect was proposed from any quarter. To all appearance, these grants might still have been going on, but for the action which the Methodists took. Mr. Forster gave way on this point almost immediately after it had been urged by the Wesleyan deputation. And yet, because the abolition of these grants—sealed as law by the passing of the Bill in August, 1870—did not actually take effect until the 31st of December, Mr. Forster has been more abused by far by those who themselves never thought of asking for the cessation of such grants at all, than he would have been if he had left them still in full operation; as much so, indeed, as he could have been if he had introduced such grants for the first time, had created them as a new feature of administration, or had largely increased them in proportionate amount.

Men have spoken wildly and wrathfully about "a year of grace," an "extension of time," and I know not what. Such phrases, so far as they ever had any applicability to the Bill, applied to an entirely separate set of provisions, which had nothing whatever to do with building grants. The truth as to the building grants is simple and soon told. Building

* Report of the adjourned meeting of the United Committees on Primary Education, p. 173. London Wesleyan Conference Office, 1870.

grants for day-schools were granted under the "Revised Code" of Regulations. This Code came to an end, and was superseded by the New Code, on the 31st of March, 1871, or immediately thereafter. In all other respects in which the Act introduced any change into the administration of existing schools and school interests, these changes began, accordingly, on the 1st of April, 1871. For example, denominational inspection came to an end, and, undenominational, merely territorial, inspection began, and the Conscience Clause was required to be set up in all schools, at that date. Whereas, by a special exception, building grants came to an end three months earlier—on December 31, 1870. There is no more foundation than this for the outcry about "extension of time" for building grants. It is the opposite of the truth. The first change of administration effected by the Bill, the earliest by three months, so far as respected existing schools, was the stoppage of building grants. The Bill passed August 9, 1870; no application for a building grant was entertained by the Department that was not presented, in its completed form, by or before December 31, 1870. As for the idea that the grants could all be stopped on the very day of the passing of the Act, it is simply absurd—the proposition would have been against all justice as well as all precedent. There were hundreds of cases, in regard to which preliminary inquiries had been made from the Education Department, and projects started, but which had not been formally entered; there were hundreds more which had been entered, but not completed; it would have been impossible to strangle all these cases by the clause of a Bill, late and suddenly introduced. No

Government would have ventured on the responsibility of such a feat; no Parliament would have sanctioned it; no precedent could have been found for so violent a procedure. As a matter of fact, Mr. Forster's clause for bringing building grants to an end with the end of the year passed without opposition or discussion. Neither Mr. Dixon nor any one else ever proposed in Parliament any amendment for the instantaneous arrest and extinction of all building grant operations. If any such amendment had been put on the notice paper of the House, it is certain it would never have got a hearing in the House. Is it possible, therefore, to conceive of anything much more disreputable in the annals of politico-ecclesiastical controversy, than that Mr. Forster should have been abused, as he has been, on the charge of his having done, in fact, the contrary of what he actually did; or that he should have been made an unpardonable offender for not having done that which no member of the party that makes it its almost chief business to malign him ever ventured to propose to the House of Commons that he should be asked to do?

There is an interval, it is true, which may, in a certain sense, be called an interval of grace, connected with the working of the Act, but it has nothing to do with building grants. I refer to the interval allowed by the Act, after the educational deficiency of any district has been determined, for voluntary effort to make provision for the deficiency set forth, before the Department requires a School Board to be constituted, and to do the needful work. This interval cannot exceed six months, but is otherwise indefinite. Long before any district in the country had such an interval "of grace" allowed to it, all building

grants under the Act had come to an end.* The whole period during which applications for such grants could be made after the passing was about eighteen weeks. During those eighteen weeks the Voluntaries, especially the Church of England, certainly exerted themselves wonderfully. A considerable proportion, however, of their applications have proved abortive. The projects have not been carried out. The actual number of school-buildings erected and of grants received is, perhaps, not more than two-thirds of what at one time seemed likely to come forward. Meantime to the Methodists must be assigned the responsibility of having brought the system of building grants to an end. That system had done good work for the nation in its time. Without it schools would have been much fewer. But its administration had left rankling memories behind, because of instances of unfairness, which in Mr. Lingen's time had become frequent, and indeed systematic, in dealing with applications supported respectively by the parochial clergy or by Nonconformist committees. Under the new Act, moreover, the cases of school-buildings required in specially destitute localities can be met by the School Board provision. To proscribe voluntary co-operation with the State

* Originally the interval allowed to voluntary effort was to have been limited not to "six months," but to "one year," as a maximum. Afterwards this maximum was reduced to six months. I believe that in his Parliamentary exposition of the measure Mr. Forster used the expression a "year of grace" in regard to this maximum. But in any case the "grace" had no reference to any interval allowed for obtaining building grants. Yet in all the angry discussions on Mr. Forster's treachery the phrase has been used as if there were still "a year" to be allowed—and in all cases—and as if the "grace" was an extension of the period originally assigned by the Bill for the cessation of building grants. In fact, the current allegation has been most curiously false in all respects.

on the part of Christian communities in the work of educating the people, would have been wanton waste and intolerable oppression. To stimulate and help forward the provision of school-buildings for the poor by specific grants in aid of building voluntary schools was no longer necessary, and therefore no longer advisable.

The first function of the Boards which were to be established under the Act was to be the establishment of schools to the extent required in each locality. It was assumed that there ought to be school provision for a number of children equal to one-sixth of the whole population. Special inspectors were to be sent forth to examine all existing schools, of whatever sort, and their report, subject to appeal to the Education Department, was to determine what schools, because of unsuitable premises or inefficient instruction, or for both reasons, were not to be counted as available to supply education. All schools not thus disqualified were to be reckoned as providing education according to their capacity, determined upon a regulation scale of measurement. Thus by an initial survey the total educational supply in the country was to be ascertained, and the result was to be published in detail. Thus every School Board would be enabled to understand what was the actual provision, and to calculate the amount of deficiency to be supplied. It was then to be the duty of the School Board to fill this up.

School Boards, however, were not made necessary, in the first instance, except in the case of London. Boroughs and parishes were to apply to have School Boards established. But Boards were to be imposed by

the Department wherever, after a deficiency had been ascertained, upon the survey and calculation of the Department, and had been announced by public notice, such deficiency was not supplied, within six months after such announcement, by voluntary effort and undertaking. School Boards were, therefore, to be established wherever there was an ultimate deficiency which voluntary enterprise failed to meet; and they might be established wherever a duly constituted representative meeting, as defined by the Act, made a requisition for a Board to be established.

For it was not to be their sole and whole duty to supply deficiencies, and to set up and manage such schools as might be necessary. It was also to be a part of their function and power, if they thought fit to undertake the work, to compel the attendance of all children at school between the years of five and thirteen, provided always that they did not contravene in any way the existing Factory and other Acts for securing half-time labour and half-time education between certain fixed ages. The Act, however, made no provision for indirect compulsion. Indeed, such provision, being in the Home Secretary's department, could only be made by a separate enactment. For want of such collateral and corroborative legal provision of indirect compulsion it was foreseen, from the first, by practical educationists, that the Act could never prove thoroughly effective as a measure for compelling education, except, perhaps, within some special and limited areas.

The fact that the compulsory provisions of the Act were permissive only has been regarded by some persons as a defect. It is certain, however, that no measure for universal compulsion would have passed

Parliament. Moreover, the great thing is to learn how to compel, to ascertain by trial the detailed provisions necessary to carry out compulsion. Experience has now abundantly proved that this could only be learnt by many and various experiments. Nor is it probable that the same methods and expedients will ever apply to the whole country. Even towns differ greatly from each other in this respect; while the case of agricultural districts is so entirely different from that of large towns, that the same provisions which apply to the one would never apply to the other.

Such is an outline of the famous Act which it was the high distinction of Mr. Forster to carry through Parliament in 1870, and to conduct in such a manner through its various stages as commanded the highest tribute of thanks from his chief, and warm and hearty eulogies from all quarters of the House.

Before I proceed to offer some remarks on the general principles of the Act, it will be proper to trace the genealogy of legislative attempts and ideas by which the country has been led to the result of carrying the present measure into law.

Several ineffectual, and yet not altogether abortive, because by no means useless, attempts in the direction of the Act had prepared the way among well-instructed friends and leaders of education for the acceptance of Mr. Forster's Bill. The main ideas of his measure were local boards and local rating, the preservation and utilisation of existing schools, the incorporation in one system of the voluntary schools and the newly created Board schools, the power of converting or transforming voluntary schools into Board schools, the universal requisition and enforcement of a strict

Conscience Clause, the separation of the voluntary provision for religious instruction from the public provision and responsibility for secular instruction, and the permissive provisions for compulsory education. As originally drawn, the Bill made provision for extending aid from local rates to voluntary inspected schools, where such aid might be a mutual economy and advantage both to the managers and the ratepaying public. This provision would have brought such schools into direct relation with the Boards, as themselves Board schools in a modified sense, and would have given the Boards certain responsibilities and rights in regard to such schools. Now there can be no doubt that the immediate progenitor of Mr. Forster's Cabinet measure of 1870 is to be found in the "Education of Poor Bill," which was brought into the House of Commons in 1867 by Mr. Bruce, Mr. W. E. Forster, and Mr. Algernon Egerton. There can be as little doubt that the real, though not so modern or so well remembered, original of this Bill was the "Manchester and Salford Boroughs Education Bill," which was brought into the House of Commons in the Session of 1851-2. Mr. Egerton, whose name stood on the back of the later Bill, was confessedly the personal representative of the same earnest and influential union of the friends of education in Manchester which brought forward the earlier Bill. Fourteen or fifteen years, indeed, had not passed without taking away some who had taken an active part in preparing the Bill of 1851. Mr. Entwisle, M.P., was no longer living; others had died or had left Manchester. But Canon Richson and several more still remained at their post ready to lend their best help to any honest

endeavour to solve the educational problem of the nation. These, joined by some earnest and candid men, who had originally been supporters of Mr. Fox's Secular Bill, but who had learned practical wisdom by the experience of the intervening years, put the machinery into motion which in 1867 brought forth to public view the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton, of whom the two former belonged in 1867 to "Her Majesty's Opposition." It is not possible, indeed, to read the projected Bill of 1851 without recognising that it contains the substance of the Bill which was brought forward in 1867. The points of coincidence between the two may be noted. Both were devised in Manchester; both had reference to individual boroughs (or districts); in both the local authority was to be the District Committee elected by the Town Council (or by the ratepayers in other districts); both gave such Committees authority to levy local rates; both adopted existing schools as the basis of operation, and only contemplated the establishment of new schools in order to supplement the others where there might be need; both provided for the transference on fair terms of existing schools to the District Committee; both assumed that in all schools under the District Committee the reading of the Holy Scriptures should be part of the daily instruction of the scholars; both enforced a Conscience Clause, substantially equivalent to that which is contained in the present Government Act; both made provision for a system of local and subordinate inspection; both recognised the supreme authority of the Committee of Privy Council over the local schools and the local inspection; both erred by reason of their

large provision of free education. The Manchester and Salford Bill, indeed, provided for the universal remission of fees in district schools, and the universal payment of fees on a certain defined scale in incorporated voluntary schools. The Bill of 1867 provided for the separate establishment of free schools as a special class of schools. Manchester is, it can hardly be doubted, learning by degrees how injurious is the element of free education in a popular system. That great city would hardly now, as in 1851, propose to educate all free. The operations of its "Education Aid Society," and, yet more recently, of the two borough School Boards in respect to the wholesale payment and remission of fees under the Act, can hardly have failed to leave important lessons on this point behind.

The measure of 1870 was stronger, more decisive, and more sweeping than the Bill of 1867. It was not the proposal of some private members, apart from any party, but the Cabinet measure of a most powerful Government. As such it was not partial, but universal, in its scope : it was imperative as to most of its provisions, although it was permissive in its compulsory clauses. Add to the Bill of 1867 the strong outline of administrative interference which, about the same period, Mr. Lowe sketched out as necessary in order to carry out the work of national education ; add further, the compulsory clauses which Mr. (now Sir Thomas) Bazley desired to add to the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton ; and we have, in fact, the Bill of 1870, as originally prepared by Mr. Forster. In his address, delivered at Edinburgh in November, 1867, on Classical and Primary Education, Mr. Lowe expressed himself as follows :—

"I would say, commence a survey and report upon Great Britain parish by parish; report to the Privy Council in London the educational wants in each parish, the number of schools, the number of children, and what is wanted to be done in order to place within the reach of the people of that parish a sufficient amount of education. When that has been done, I think it should be the duty of the Privy Council to give notice to that parish that they should found a school, or whatever may be wanted for the purposes of that parish. If the parish found a school, then it would be the duty of the Privy Council to assist it, and that in the same way as it assists the schools already in existence. If the parish does not agree to do what needs to be done, then I think there ought to be power vested in the Privy Council, or the Secretary of State, or some other great responsible public officer, to make a compulsory rate on them to found that school. I think the schools they found should be entitled to the same inspection and examination as the schools already in existence, and receive the same grants for results."

Here we have in precise and full outline the provisions actually contained in the Act with regard to the powers of initiation and interference possessed by the Privy Council for ascertaining the need and compelling the supply of education throughout the country. The super-addition of these provisions to the machinery for erecting and administering District School Committees (or Boards, in the language of the Act), provided by the Bills of 1851 and 1867, converted the local and permissive Manchester proposals into a national measure. In his official measure

Mr. Forster adopted exactly the proposals as to compulsory education which Mr. Bazley had desired to incorporate with the Bill of 1867, leaving the option of adopting the compulsory clauses with each locality respectively.

In this sketch of the historical descent and origination of the Act, I have connected closely and immediately together the Manchester and Salford Bill of 1851 and the Bill of Messrs. Bruce, Forster, and Egerton (which was currently and shortly known in 1867 and 1868 as "the Manchester Bill"), because the virtual identity of the two is a well-known fact, and is evidenced by the identity of local origin, of leading promoters, and of the essential ideas in the two Bills. I may, however, remind my readers that, between 1851 and 1867, two schemes had been introduced into the House of Commons, from opposite sides of the House, one by Lord John Russell in 1856 (*Resolutions for Establishing a System of Education*), and the other by Sir J. Pakington (*The Borough Education Bill*), both of which embodied the essential principles of the Manchester and Salford Bill, and helped to prepare the country and Parliament for accepting the principles of Mr. Forster's Bill in 1870.

To Manchester, therefore, we owe the line of ideas and influence, educational and political, which has brought the nation into the possession of the present Education Act. This claim has indeed of late been set up on behalf of Birmingham. It is curious that such a claim should be set up, considering how far the Birmingham League has made it its business to abuse the Act. It is, however, in no sense true. Even the compulsory element of the Act was not

derived from Birmingham, but from Manchester. Birmingham would at once have made compulsion (on paper) universally imperative, and so would have failed, as must by this time be apparent to nearly all the world. Mr. Forster, by adopting compulsion in the Manchester form and degree, has succeeded so far more widely and thoroughly than could have been hoped, and has prepared the way for farther and larger success. The Birmingham League, in fact, was only initiated in any distinct outline late in 1869, while the important Manchester Conference on National Education—over which Mr. Bruce presided, and which (somewhat to Mr. Bruce's alarm) pronounced particularly in favour of compulsion, while, in general, it went, on the subjects involved, in favour of the proposals included in "the Manchester Bill"—was held early in 1868. To Manchester, accordingly, the origin and centre of the Free Trade movement, belongs also the credit of having originated and fostered the ideas to the prevalence of which the nation owes the present Education Act.

Let me now proceed to state synoptically the principles which underlie the new Act.

1. The first is that of local responsibility, as distinguished from, yet not superseding, but partly concurrent with and partly subordinate to, national responsibility, in regard to the primary education of the people.

In the United States local responsibility, as we have seen, is all in all; there is no national control or direction, there is practically no national responsibility, in regard to popular education. On the Continent generally, if not universally, the principle of local responsibility is recognised, and, indeed, the

primary responsibility for school provision rests with the commune (*gemeinde*) or parish, or with the municipality. Other jurisdictions, however, concur, and are, in some respects, superior. The district or province, or the canton, and the State educational bureau or department, have their authority, their share in inspection and direction, and some part of the financial burden to bear; and for each country or canton there is a completely organized and harmonious system. Mr. Forster's measure is the first step taken in this country in the way of recognising and developing local responsibility and authority in the matter of popular education. The circumstances of England, however, have precluded the local authority, the local elective School Board, from occupying such a relation to popular education generally, as the corresponding authority holds in Continental countries. In Continental countries all the schools of popular education stand equally related to the Local School Council or Board. But then on the Continent there is no such distinction as that in this country between voluntary religious schools and School Board schools, for the decisive reason that (except only in Holland), all primary schools are denominationally regulated and administered. The Church pastors are usually the local school inspectors, are always the chief acting school managers; the school teachers are strictly identified with the churches and congregations, are almost always virtually, if not expressly, church officers. If the Education Bill had passed as originally drawn, there would have been some resemblance to the same condition of things in the case of denominational and denominationally managed schools adopted

by the School Boards. But this class of schools was not allowed to be constituted; and, as things are, there is an entire separation between the School Board schools and voluntary schools. Over these latter the School Boards have no jurisdiction. Whether it is desirable that, in this respect, matters should remain precisely as they are, is a point to which I shall presently advert.

2. The second principle I note in the Education Act is the principle of purely secular co-operation and direction on the part of the Central Government, coupled with the provision that the local authority, the School Board of each school district, whether such district be parochial, poly-parochial, municipal, or metropolitan, shall be at liberty to determine as it pleases respecting the religious instruction to be given in the schools, provided only that no denominational formulary be taught. By means of this twofold principle the Government has been enabled to make provision for the education of all the population, without either, on the one hand, compromising itself, as a central and imperial authority, with the teaching of religion, or with any payment on account of such teaching; or, on the other hand, adopting the principle of secular education as fit and adequate to meet the moral and intellectual wants of the people, in respect of school instruction. The first point, irresponsibility as to religious instruction on the part of the Government, is secured by the provision in the Act (97 [1]) which declares that the Government "grant shall not be made in respect of any instruction in religious subjects," coupled with the clause in the code which provides on what distinct considerations and to what amount

the grants shall actually be made to schools on inspection. The second point, freedom of the School Board to give religious instruction, is secured by the general powers given to School Boards, taken in connection with the absence of all directions or restrictions respecting religious instruction, except as regards the use of denominational formularies.

A question has arisen in some minds whether the purely negative or neutral position now held by the Government in regard to the point of religious instruction is not inconsistent with the principle maintained by all statesmen and by the Education Department up to the year 1870, that the moral element in education is the most important element, and Christian culture the great educational want of the country.

The system of public elementary education for the people of England, which has been more or less in operation during the last generation, was, as I have shown from authoritative public documents, originated between the years 1839 and 1846, by our English statesmen, our Queen, and the Parliament of this realm, mainly from a sense of the deplorable condition of the lower working classes of this country in respect to common morality and all that belongs to the proper culture of a Christian nation. The grievous deficiencies of the population in respect to mental discipline and general instruction and enlightenment were indeed felt to be a sore evil and loss, and, in themselves, also a cause of demoralisation. But yet the chief, the most pressing, the crying want of the country was declared to be a moral want. It seems to be thought by some that, in this respect at any rate, the basis and meaning of our national

system is now changed. There is no guarantee, it has been said, that religion will be taught in any manner or measure, directly or indirectly, in the public elementary schools of this country. A school may be Christian, but it may also be merely secular. And this appears to be regarded as equivalent to an elimination of Christianity from the character of our national education.

Plausible as this view may appear, when thus generally stated, it is certainly not correct. There is an excellent ancient caution in regard to the terms of an argument which I conceive to be illustrated in the present instance. *Dolus latet in generalibus.* General terms and propositions are apt to harbour fallacies under their vague amplitude. The fallacy in this case appears to me to be very near akin to that which argues that the disestablishment of the National Church would destroy the Christian character of the nation. I should be exceedingly sorry to say a word that might be fairly construed as tending to countenance the organized agitation in this country which aims to disendow and dissolve the foundations of the Church of England. But it is a weak and unwise argument which seeks to sustain that Church by alleging that the Christian character of our nation and our Government depends upon the maintenance of what is spoken of as the National Church Establishment. The people and Government of the United States are not made either more or less Christian by the fact that in the States there has never been an Established Church. The Christian character of the Irish people has not been destroyed, nor has that of the British Empire and Government been impaired, by the mere act of disestablishing the

Irish Church. If, by general consent, the people of this country were to renounce all care about the Christian instruction and training of their children, they would prove themselves to have lost in general the Christian character. If the Parliament were to enact a law prohibiting all Christian instruction in public elementary schools, and imposing discouragements and disabilities on all teachers and teaching that made Christian truth and principle an essential element in education, such an enactment would, as it seems to me, be an antichristian enactment, and go far to show that Parliament, in its collective capacity, was ruled by an antichristian spirit. But merely to leave Christianity, apart from State regulation or State payment, but yet free and welcome to work in co-operation with the State for the education, in the widest sense, and morally as well as intellectually, of the children of the country; to leave to Christianity, unendowed, but also unembarrassed, such liberty of voluntary action as this, in the great enterprise of providing for the education of the nation, seems to me to involve no departure whatever from the true principles of Christian legislation. The same end is aimed at now by the promoters of the measure which last August became law as was aimed at thirty years ago by the Queen and Parliament. "It is her Majesty's wish," said Lord Russell more than thirty years ago, in his famous letter to Lord Lansdowne, "that the youth of her kingdom should be religiously brought up, and that the rights of conscience should be respected." Such was then the spirit of our educational legislation; its spirit is the same still. By the operation of the new Act the rights of conscience will certainly be more largely and strictly

secured than by the legislation of the interval between 1839 and 1846; at the same time I believe that a far wider extension will be given to the power of religious truth and influence in the bringing up of the youth of the country than was or could be done in connection with that legislation. The measures which were conceived and initiated by Lord Russell, Lord Lansdowne, and Sir James P. Kay-Shuttleworth thirty years ago, have, through their operation during the generation now drawing to a close, been chiefly instrumental in preparing the way for that growth of public opinion, and that condition of educational development, which have made a great new measure possible. But they were of necessity tentative, preliminary, and altogether limited and permissive in their scope and operation. The measures of the last generation of statesmen were adapted to the conditions of the time; they were in fact, as was conclusively proved by a series of legislative experiments, the only measures in the direction of public education for the people generally which could at that time have been passed, or which, having passed into law, could have been successfully carried into effect. The Act which passed last session, on the other hand, is adapted to the circumstances of the present time, but could not have been proposed in 1840. Parliament found it utterly impossible thirty years ago to carry any general and comprehensive scheme for covering the country with public elementary schools entirely apart from all voluntary organizations. No system of such public schools could be organized on a common official basis, or managed from a common departmental centre. The country would neither tolerate a secular system, nor a composite system,

nor an exclusive Anglican system. It was found impossible to organize a central State Training College; and the times were very far indeed from being ripe for local rates, for local Boards, and for the local settlement of the difficulties connected with the question of religious instruction. It only remained, accordingly, for the State to enter into relations with existing organizations for the education of the people. It could do nothing but go into partnership with the religious educational societies, agreeing to help, in proportion to the training of the teachers and the efficiency of the schools, those voluntary organizations which already had the work of popular education absolutely in their own hands, and endeavouring, in the capacity of a critical, wealthy, and influential friend, to improve to the utmost the quality of the education given, and to promote its spread among the masses of the people.

This was accordingly the position in which the State had stood towards the question of education for a quarter of a century, up to the last session of Parliament. In this relation the State aided with its oversight, its counsel, and its pecuniary bounty the different Christian denominations in their educational efforts, and the excellent British and Foreign School Society, which has been always sustained by various denominations. There were no other bodies to be helped. And these were all organized upon a basis at once voluntary and Christian. There were no secular organizations of educational zeal and benevolence to aid, none which the State could even be asked to recognise. The only schools, accordingly, which under the Minutes of Privy Council could be recognised or aided, were such as proceeded upon

the basis of religious instruction, and possessed a distinctly Christian character. If an association to promote schools on a purely secular basis were formed, it was not likely that Government would consent to help such an association, because if it was not originated in a spirit of undisguised hostility to Christianity, it was certain that such an association could not be adapted to meet the case of the children of the poorest and really neglected classes. If the State by its Central Department of Education, and as representative, which it could not but be, of the nation, had committed itself to the recognition and aid of such a purely secular association, it would have committed itself to a general principle, or else to a special purpose, utterly opposed to the deepest and most sacred convictions of the nation at large. The only principle, in short, on which it was possible for the State to proceed with any regard either to the convictions of the nation or to practical wisdom and policy, was to ally itself closely and exclusively with the Christian voluntary associations for promoting the education of the people.

But now, instead of there being one sole centre, the one national and metropolitan centre, from which alone all State help is to flow to public schools, and by which all the responsibility and direction which belong to the State in regard to such schools are to be administered, there is created a large class of public schools, principally maintained and immediately managed, apart from all voluntary contributions and organizations, by popularly elected local boards, which boards have authority to raise and administer local rates for the support of such schools.

The conditions and circumstances, accordingly, under which these schools exist are entirely new; so new that the same rules of administration which regulated, and must still in the main continue to regulate, the relations of the State with voluntary schools, no longer apply, except very partially, to this class of schools. The problem is simplified. Its essential elements are contained within the limits of the locality for each particular case, and vary according to the locality; and the solutions of the problem may vary according to the variety of cases. The responsibility also is limited. The principle of local responsibility and self-government is called in. London is to care and administer for London, Bristol for Bristol, Durham for Durham, not the Parliament of England for the collective education, and the individual management, of the schools of all England. Within assigned limits each local authority may do what may be deemed best in regard to the particular case with which it has to deal, without its being at all implied that the council of the whole nation, the imperial Parliament, could or would legislate for the whole kingdom on the same principles of administration which are thought to be practicable and expedient for any particular locality. As to this particular, if in respect to no other, England has gained a valuable hint from the United States. In the States the actual erection and the maintenance and management of each school are entirely in the hands of each several township, or municipality, or county, as the case may be. The outlay and responsibility begin and end there. All the funds are raised and spent within the district. In this way the difficulties of a complicated national problem are escaped, and each particular

locality adapts its school to the particular requirements of the place.

Now, we have not in this country attained to such an elementary simplicity as this, in regard to our new class of School Board schools. Nor, I confess, do I desire that we ever should. In the United States the want of anything like an accepted and connected system of schools and of national education, the want of any national centre or department of education whatever, the grievous deficiencies of the country in respect of training colleges, of steady, settled, and thoroughly educated teachers, and of effective school examination and inspection, are points in the condition of the national education which we in England certainly need not regard with envy. The management of schools in that great country is much too absolutely local; there is far too little of the truly national element in general oversight and in organized correspondence and unity. But yet it is a great advantage to have taken the leaf out of the American book which we find in the new Act. The principle of local responsibility and self-government is one of the most valuable principles rooted in the English soil. To many matters it has been applied ever since we were a nation. Of late years it has been extended to many new matters in its application and operation. In regard to no great question of national well-being will its application, as I trust, prove more fruitful in benefits than in regard to education.

As respects the religious question, then, the Parliament, that is, the nation, has now devolved the responsibility in relation to School Board schools absolutely on the Local Board, with two guards only, viz., that no denominational formulary is to be used

in any of the rate-supported schools, and that, as respects religious instruction, the Conscience Clause must be enforced. The Parliament within these constitutional limits trusts the local representative body—the School Board—with the interests of religion in the matter of education, even as the Parliament itself is trusted in regard to the same matter by the nation at large. It is as reasonable and as venerable a principle to trust the general interests of religion in the matter of education in any given locality to the local representatives of the population freely chosen, as it is to entrust the same on the broad national scale to the parliamentary representatives of the people, freely chosen. The Local Board is fitter to exercise a judgment on what are local needs in such a case than any centralised Government department could be; while it is certain that no imperial Act could settle, by any subtlety of legislation, the details of a measure which should provide beforehand for all the exigencies which might arise in the thousand varieties of town and country school districts throughout the land.

The event has proved the wisdom of the course adopted by Government and Parliament. The people have responded well to the trust imposed upon them by the Legislature. As to Christian principle and religious feeling, it may be doubted whether there are half-a-dozen School Boards which may not be favourably compared with the House of Commons. Whatever town councils may be, and into whatever hands the elections for town councils may have commonly fallen, the friends of Christian education, the representatives of the disinterested Christian zeal which has founded and carried on the tens of thousands of day and

Sunday schools in this country, have made their influence paramountly felt in the election of the School Boards. The electors have settled the principle of Bible instruction as a household and universal principle to be observed in the public schools of this country.

My conclusion, on the whole, is that the cause of religious, of Christian, education will lose nothing by the new Act. I trust it will gain much. The denominational schools will continue; many of the voluntary schools of the British and Foreign School Society will remain. The School Boards will be pervaded with a Christian spirit. The teachers of the new schools will be generally under the influence of Christian principles. The Bible will be taught, will in general be intelligently and reverently taught, will often be affectionately and prayerfully taught, in the new Board schools. Thus far there has been no departure in our legislation from the old landmarks of religious reverence and Christian principle. It is as true now as it was under the Privy Council Minutes of 1846, that a system of pervasive national education from which religion and religious teaching should be excluded, would not meet the national needs, and would be opposed to the claims of Christian faith and religion. Christians, who support the present Act, may still consistently maintain that to undertake to civilise the lowest million of English children by means of rigidly-restricted and low-ranged secular schools, children for the most part utterly without Christian instruction or influence at home,—that to provide by bare and rudimentary secular schools for the reclamation of the Arabs of the streets of the lowest *residuum*, as it is called, of our lowest classes,

is a project which sounds like a monstrous paradox when propounded by a Christian believer. The new Act has come to the rescue in our educational difficulties by the application to the problem of national education of the ancient principle of local responsibility and government, but it has offered no slight to the principle of religious instruction. It has done England the great benefit of creating many new centres of educational power and extension, thus enabling the country effectually to grapple with a hydra evil which could never have been mastered by any combination of agencies commissioned and regulated by one central bureau, by a Government department at Whitehall; but the Act has not abrogated the principles which have hitherto been recognised in the national administration of the Education Department, nor has it in any essential particular interfered with the relations between the central State Department of Education and the voluntary schools of primary instruction which had been brought into alliance with the State. It has not unfairly or oppressively interfered with the character and management of the denominational and British Schools. Rather, I think we may hope that they will be better for the Act and not worse.

3. The Act has introduced certain changes as respects primary education by means of voluntary schools.

(1.) First, the Act has put an end to *building grants.* This, however, was done by way of amendment upon the Bill, in conformity with the resolution and the petition to Parliament of the representative Committee of the Wesleyan Methodists, themselves an educating denomination. They thought it emi-

nently desirable at this stage in the development of our national education to make an entire separation as to real property and legal control between the different Churches and the State in respect of school-buildings. They did not wish it to be possible for public money to be contributed towards the acquisition of what, to the vulgar apprehension, would always appear to be merely Church property. From this time forth not a halfpenny can ever be asked from Government towards the building of a Wesleyan, or a Church of England, or any other denominational or "voluntary" school.

(2.) The Act has made it imperative that in every school examined by her Majesty's inspectors and receiving grants towards maintenance from the public revenue, the rights of conscience, in the fullest sense, shall be punctiliously respected, and the Conscience Clause publicly and conspicuously exhibited on the wall of the principal schoolroom. For twenty years the Government used their utmost influence in vain to induce the great National School Society of the Church of England to accept the principle of a Conscience Clause. Strong prejudice, blinded zeal, the unconscious intolerance bred by ancient prescription, by the principles of sacerdotalism, and by the atmosphere of caste, had made that Society impervious alike to the warnings and arguments of statesmen, to the threats of embittered enemies, to the remonstrances of those who, though not of the Anglican communion, had no desire to see the Church of England cast down and laid waste through the enmity and indignation which her own oppressions had excited, and to the reasonings and entreaties of many of her own most distinguished

sons. At length the just decree has gone forth, a decree which should have gone forth long years ago. The Conscience Clause must be fully accepted and absolutely respected, or no Government grant can be paid to the school, even though it be a school of the Church of England. The new Act has made such now to be the law of the land.

(3.) The new Act has obliterated, so far as respects the part taken by Government in regard to the voluntary schools, all traces of denominational distinction, and also of direct religious function and responsibility. There are no Government inspectors of Church of England schools, as such, or of Wesleyan or British schools as such. Every inspector will have equally under his eye all the inspected schools of the district assigned to him, of whatever character or denomination they may be, including the new School Board schools. It will be no part of the duty of any inspector to examine the children of any school in religious knowledge. Training colleges come, in this respect, under the same regulation as the inspected day schools. Church of England training colleges will no longer be examined of necessity, or as of right, by Church of England inspectors, nor will the inspectors examine the students in Church of England training colleges any longer in religious knowledge. Such examinations will, in future, be conducted in all colleges according to regulations determined, and by examiners appointed, by the authorities of the college, altogether apart from the Education Department at Whitehall.

These regulations have disembarrassed the State and its Educational Department from all connection,

in respect of religion or religious teaching, with the voluntary schools. They have abated, as far as was compatible with the vitality and efficiency of the schools, their denominational character, while they have invested them with a distinct and definite national character, and constituted them a true and integral element in a comprehensive and really national system of public schools. The Wesleyan schools in England are not called "National Schools," as are in Ireland the Non-Vested or denominational schools of Methodism, Presbyterianism, the Episcopal Church (late of England and Ireland), and the Roman Catholics. But in their real character the denominational schools in England are at least as well entitled to be styled National as the schools in Ireland, which are described as Non-Vested; on which schools, instead of Presbyterian Day-school, or Wesleyan Methodist Day-school, or any other denominational designation, National School is inscribed as their legal style and title.

It will be instructive, and at the present moment peculiarly seasonable, if I now proceed to follow out the remark which I have last made by a comparison between the English system of education as now amended and the Irish National System. Our denominational schools in this country have, by the changes in their relation to the State which I have just described, been conformed in several important respects to the condition of the Non-Vested National Schools of Ireland; and where a difference still remains in the legal relations connecting the schools with the State, that difference will be found, if I do not mistake, to be such as proves the Irish schools

to be, in comparison of the English, excessively favoured and indulged *in their denominational character.*

1. The Irish *Non-Vested* National Schools are under the protection of a stringent Conscience Clause, and are also, I believe, under undenominational inspection, although they are under the direction of denominational managers, and are taught by denominational teachers. But then it must be remembered that much the greater part of the maintenance of these Irish denominational "National Schools" is derived from the public revenue; whilst, under the most favourable circumstances, it is impossible for any English denominational school to obtain a larger pecuniary contribution from the Government than one-half of the annual cost of maintaining the school, the average proportion of Government aid being considerably less than one-half; and it must further be remembered that many of the non-vested schools of Ireland are both managed and taught by Romish ecclesiastics or *réligieuses,* and that of the rest a very large proportion are under the absolute government of the clergy of the various Protestant denominations, without any lay control or co-operation whatever; whereas our English denominational schools cannot be taught by ecclesiastical persons, and are all of them required to be under the management of responsible committees in which the lay element must take its due place.

Much has been said of the danger of conceding the denominational system to Ireland. Too much cannot be said, nor can too strenuous efforts be made, against conceding to Ireland such a denominational system as Ultramontane bishops demand for it, and

as some statesmen on both sides of the House might a few years since have been disposed to concede to Ultramontane clamours and influence. This country, however, is now too enlightened to allow any Government to pass a measure for Ireland such as would never be granted to the clamours of the priesthood in any Popish country of Europe. Just as Austria, after lying so long under the eclipse of its Concordat, has emerged from beneath its baleful shadow, and is redeeming its national education from the power of the priesthood, it would be unspeakable degradation, it would be suicidal folly, if the British Parliament were to suffer Ireland to come under a legalised bondage, worse even than that which was imposed by the Austrian Concordat.

Whilst, however, opposed in this sense to the concession to Ireland of what would be understood there by the designation "a denominational system," it is necessary continually to insist that the present so-called National System of Ireland *is* denominational to a degree which far exceeds, in some cardinal particulars, what has ever been known of day-school denominationalism in this country, and which, now that the new Act has come into operation, renders our guarded and abated denominationalism in this country absolutely national in comparison. To carry denominationalism in Ireland further than it has been already carried would be an excess indeed.

2. We have seen how essentially denominational are those Non-Vested schools of Ireland of which Government bears three-fourths of the expense. We have seen, also, that these Non-Vested schools constitute by far the largest proportion—constitute, let me say in plain arithmetic, *five-sevenths* of the Irish

National Schools. But it has also been shown that, on the whole, the *Vested* schools themselves can hardly be said to be less denominational or more truly national than the Non-Vested. It is true, indeed, that the Vested schools have been built at the sole expense of the State, and that the State bears nearly the whole annual cost; but it would hardly prove Wesleyan day-schools to be national institutions if all that could be said was that the Government had borne and was bearing nearly all the cost of them, while Wesleyan committees and teachers had the entire control of them. It is true, also, that these schools, built by the State, are vested in national trustees. But it is equally true that they are managed entirely and almost irresponsibly by denominational patrons, by patrons who are, in the great majority of cases, either Protestant clergymen or (much more commonly) Roman Catholic priests. These intensely denominational patrons are not encumbered in their control and administration by any committees; the schools are not under committees. The patrons, it is true, are bound to respect the Conscience Clause, and if they infringe it, the parents can appeal to the inspectors and the National Board. But the patrons can dismiss the teacher at their own mere pleasure, without his having any power of appeal; and in these Vested National Schools religious instruction of the most pronounced character is regularly given. The Roman Catholic catechism, the Episcopalian and Presbyterian catechisms, all the catechisms, are taught by the different denominational teachers respectively under the direction of the patron, who himself, within certain hours, is at liberty to take what part

in the religious instruction he thinks proper. Such are the Vested schools of Ireland, *the* "National Schools" *par excellence.* The Non-Vested and the Vested schools, seven thousand in number, make up all the National Schools of Ireland, with the exception of the few (twenty-seven) "model schools," so called, which are under the direct management of the central National Board at Dublin. But even in *these* schools, it should be remembered, the respective catechisms of the different denominations are taught, it being arranged, as far as possible, that where the population around is mixed, there should be two or even three teachers in the model school of different religious persuasions, so that each may teach the catechism to the children of his co-religionists.

3. Let us compare now this Irish system of so-called "National Schools" with the English system, and judge which is the less denominational, which the more truly national. Both are composite systems. But look at the elements which make up the respective wholes. Compare the Non-Vested or confessedly denominational schools of Ireland, in which are included the convent schools, with the voluntary schools of England, under the Conscience Clause of the new Act, remembering at the same time that Government hardly on an average contributes more than about one-third of the cost of maintenance in England, while in Ireland it contributes more than three-fourths. Compare the Vested schools of Ireland, managed by denominational patrons, taught by strictly denominational teachers, and in all of which denominational catechisms are taught, although they were built wholly, and are almost wholly sustained, out of the national revenue, with the School Board

schools of England, managed not by individual and intensely denominational patrons, but by popularly elected School Boards, and in which no denominational formulary can be taught. Nay, compare even the handful of model schools, of the purely national character of which we have heard so much, but in which the catechism of the Council of Trent, the Episcopal Church catechism, and the Presbyterian Assembly's catechism, are taught, with our School Board schools. How absolutely is the comparison on every ground in favour of the English system, as very far more truly national, and less deeply coloured and actuated by the sectarianism which belongs to intense and unchecked denominationalism, than the Irish National System.

As to national education, we ought to have large, various, manifold sympathies. The problem can never be solved on a narrow basis or in an intolerant spirit. It would be a great loss if all public elementary schools were to be emptied of denominational colour and character, to be conformed to one vague plan and pattern of very generic Christianity in teaching, and to be placed under the absolute control of School Boards. The truly liberal and cultivated mind has a repugnance to uniformity and stereotype, especially if the pattern stereotyped is one which can only be rendered in dim colours. We cannot but prefer variety, life, colours blended and contrasted. I rejoice in the principle of local responsibility and School Board action. But I rejoice certainly not less, and with a homelier and more personal joy, in seeing Church action in regard to national education. I cannot forget that there would have been at this hour no public elementary educa-

tion for the working people of England, but for Church action and voluntary Christian activity; that but for these there would have been no modern English science and art—the best and happiest in the world—of child-training; that but for these there would now have been no supply of teachers for the School Board schools. I believe in School Board schools, in part, because I believe in the training which the teachers who will have to handle these schools must have received in the Christian colleges, most of them denominational. School Boards and their system of schools will probably tend to enlarge and liberalise the educational spirit of the denominations and their colleges; but, on the other hand, the denominational colleges, and the spirit of Christian teaching as derived through the Christian Churches and their organizations, must be the sources of true teaching science, of trained sympathetic intelligence, of tested capacity and well-proved character, for the service of School Board schools. The highest inspiration for the work of teaching and training—the truest and most fruitful ideas and the noblest and most powerful motives—have been derived, and will continue to be derived, from the consecration, the pure and single purpose, the generous and kindly human sympathies, which are the fruit of living Christianity in principle and feeling united to the genuine teaching gift and faculty. The heart and soul of the educational movement for England must still be found in England's Churches. The choicest and most influential spirits among the brotherhood of teachers must still be gifted and enthusiastic Christian teachers. We may justly rejoice, accordingly, that whilst School

Board schools are to be multiplied, the distinctively religious schools of the various Christian Churches are to be left free—as is their right—to take the leading and distinguished part which befits them in the work of national education. Christian teachers, in express connection with Christian Churches, have been the chief educators of the world hitherto, have moulded every system of education worthy of the name, have kept alive the spirit of education, have carried its standard higher and higher from age to age, and they are not to be cashiered, they are not to be discouraged or disparaged now. This can never be done in Britain—so long as Scotland still reveres the name of Knox, and cherishes the memory of David Stowe ; and so long as in England the memory of Arnold is fresh and green.

It is astonishing what trivial sayings often pass for pregnant and momentous maxims, and are quoted as such by men who have furnished themselves at the market of cheap commonplaces with the equipment necessary for the character of a summary critic and an ostentatious disciple of modern political philosophy and progress. "A denominational system," it is said, "can never be a national system ; therefore, if England is ever to take her true place among the nations of the world and in the van of modern progress, if England is ever to be a truly educated nation, denominational schools must be done away." Now, as a matter of fact, there has hardly been an effective national system of education anywhere that was not denominational. It is granted, however, that in this country, a *denominational system* (as such) could never be a thoroughly national system. But then no one has ever desired

to have a universal denominational system, nor that public elementary schools should be simply or purely denominational. There never has been in this country, nor even in Ireland, a purely denominational system of national education. The "British" Schools, for example, were never denominational schools. The Conscience Clause and an effective Government inspection cannot but essentially modify, whether in England or Ireland, the denominational character of the schools in which they have place. The question, however, is not whether a denominational system can be a national system, but whether schools managed by denominational committees in a catholic spirit, taught by denominational teachers, yet not in the interest of any denominational Shibboleth, and worked by denominational energy—whether such schools, if at the same time invested with a national character, limited and regulated by national rules, and examined and inspected by national officers—may not form one element and one department in a grand national system of schools. The question is whether the Christian Churches, which in this country and on the Continent have thus far acted as the pioneers of progress in public and popular education, of every grade and kind, are henceforth to be dismissed from the State's educational service, and not permitted to bear their share in the great work which needs to be done.

The idea which underlies much modern declamation and very much newspaper writing on the subject of education, is that all the elementary schools of the country should be essentially of the same pattern, and that gradations of schools should rise from the elementary school upwards to the

Universities, all the schools of each grade to be essentially of the same pattern. But is this plan of stereotype life-like? Is it in harmony with the variety, freshness, and spontaneousness of life? above all, is it in keeping with the vast fecundity and various abundance of life which belong to a country like England, with its blended races, its variety of conditions, of modes of life and worship, of taste and prejudice and culture, its commerce, its manufactures, its agriculture, its peasantry and its mechanics, its trades and its professions? The men who advocate this plan of stereotype would divide the whole country as it were into rectangular plots, and in every plot would fix a school of the same type. But such mechanical uniformity is incompatible with life or true greatness. Life, on the broad scale, in any great realm of God's world, means multiplicity of types and kinds; means congenial vital conditions and spontaneous development, vivid and various colouring, and boundless diversity of character and aspect in the living forms. Fit soil, true rooting, growth, colour, foliage, are all necessary if there is to be a living plant and living fruit, and for each plant these must all follow their own law, and be "after their kinds." So it must be in the matter of education, if education is to be real, a stream from living fountains, an array of forces and influences springing from true, and therefore manifold, spiritual energy, and adapted to meet the infinite needs, powers, and unfoldings of human hearts and faculties. Let us therefore have the public school in all its varieties; of the denomination and of the School Board, of village and rural town, of the agricultural parish and the dense manufacturing population, of borough and

metropolis, of elementary and secondary and superior grade; and let there be private schools, so they be open to public examination, and conducted by trained and certificated teachers; and let there be our various Universities—all combining and harmonising into one grand national system.

I call it a system, though it be not uniform, nor divisible into equal and symmetrical portions, just as there is a system and typical principles in the vegetable kingdom; and as we speak of the stellar system, although the stars are not uniformly distributed, or equally graded, or coloured on any principle of regular alternations. This system of schools will include all that are open to public examination or inspection, that have trained and certificated teachers, and in which the rights of conscience are respected in the communication of religious instruction—all, in a word, which are conducted in harmony with the essential principles of the Act. As it seems to me, these principles are that teachers should be tested as to their competency, and that religious teachers must respect the consciences of parents and children, all else being left to be created or developed, whether by private persons or public bodies, whether by voluntary combination or by School Boards, according to the ideas, the convictions, the impulses with which the heart and soul of the nation are replenished. We may fairly call this a system; less systematic, less rigid, it is true, than the school system of Germany, but at the same time much more exact and connected than what may, by a compliment or figure of speech, be called the system of the United States; and only the more fitted to the case of England, and the more satisfactory and congenial to the thoughtful

Englishman, the truly scientific or philosophic man of progress, because it thus occupies an intermediate place between the unbending method and rubric of Teutonic drill-mastery and the expedients of Trans-atlantic Anglo-Saxondom.

Such a system as this is compatible with national life in its most varied development and its highest forms ; such a system is consistent with the rights of conscience and with national freedom in its fullest sense. It respects the conscience of the Christian as well as of the unbeliever ; of the man whose life, and that of his family, is identified with his Church, as well as of the man of cosmopolitan culture and philosophic isolation who sits loose to all Churches and all forms of creed or Christian fellowship.

It is the only system in connection with which educational compulsion may be carried out without violating the rights of conscience. On this system whoever is compelled to send his child to school will be able to find a school to which he can send him without any violence being done to his conscience.

It will be seen from the view which I have thus given of the main principles that define the recent Education Act, that I join with the great majority of the country in a high general approval of the measure. Nevertheless, it certainly can only be accepted as an important step in the right direction, well taken at the right time. The measure, regarded in itself, is doubtless imperfect. A Bill in itself much more perfect could not have passed, would not have been suitable to time and circumstances, and therefore would not have been a wise and good Bill for the year 1870. No one who studies the school system of our country, as now standing under the Act of

Parliament, can fail to perceive that it is wanting in symmetry and in economy of power. As yet, the educational forces of the country are not perfectly marshalled; the organization of the whole, on one harmonious plan, with perfect subordination of part to part, is by no means complete; some principles have been but slightly brought into play which must before long become of chief importance; some provinces of activity have only been surveyed, which ought, without delay, to be brought under administrative regulation; the great metropolitan centre of direction and reference is more than ever, is altogether exorbitantly, surcharged with responsibility in details, whilst the functions of the mutually co-ordinate sub-centres are, as yet, too meagre and too mean; a few positive mistakes and several practical defects in the new Act have been brought to light by the experience of the past two years. The Act, indeed, has, on the whole, worked wonderfully well; the errors in it have proved to be very few; and of the undeniable defects, a considerable proportion were unavoidable in a piece of legislation which could not but, in part, be tentative, and which affected so vast a field of action; some, indeed, were defects the admission of which into the measure was necessary in order to secure its passage through Parliament, and the manner, with the necessity, of correcting which could only be learnt, and the lesson generally accepted, by means of actual experience in the working of the Act. But still defects are defects, and ought to be recognised as such. The Act cannot long remain in its present form. Symmetry and economy of power in administration, consistency and completeness of organization, are not only theoretical *desiderata*, but

practical necessities, if equity and efficiency, if sure and stable working, are to be realised in the educational administration of the country.

The most obvious and the most important defect in the present system is its excessive and ill-proportioned centralisation. It is, of course, folly to take up a general and undiscriminating objection against centralisation. Centralisation is the necessary condition of high and masterly organization. But, besides the great central brain, there need to be ganglia distributed throughout the system. There must be local centres of sympathy and influence ; local sub-centres of intelligence, sensibility, and activity. In order to excite and sustain local interest, to develop and bring adequately under contribution local resources, to apply local knowledge and influence to the satisfaction of local demands and necessities, it is necessary that there should be everywhere district organization, with local centres or sub-centres. No sole imperial centre can be brought, apart from district organization and local centres, into effective relation with all parts of the country for all local purposes. There will be, without the subordinate local organization, a want of intimate local knowledge, of living local interest, of local confidence and content, of adequate moral authority and influence within the locality.

There is an element in the present system which needs only to be adequately developed in order to meet this necessity ; it will be anticipated that I refer to the District School Board. School Boards should, I cannot but think, and have for many years thought, be established everywhere, one for each school district. I would also bring all existing public or quasi-public

elementary schools within the district into relation with these Boards. As to these points I heartily agree with the suggestions of a representative committee of my own Church for the amendment of the Act, which, in January last, were laid before Mr. Gladstone. *

There are in this country many hundreds of day-schools, chiefly village schools, which, while allowed to take their place as schools for the use of all denominations, are administered strictly and exclusively on the principles and in the interest of one denomination. They receive no annual Government grant, and are not under Government inspection, though, by-the-bye (and this is a noteworthy point), a considerable number of them did, when first established, receive building grants from Government. Receiving no annual grant, and being under no State inspection, they are not under any Conscience Clause. But they were especially inspected two years ago, and are admitted as "efficient" schools, in the general census of educational supply for the country. Though uninspected, they are "efficient," and therefore they take position as quasi-public elementary schools. If they were not there, or if they were not reckoned as "efficient," or if they were discounted as not "suitable," their place would have to be supplied by an inspected voluntary school, under the Conscience Clause, or by a Board school. They cumber the country parts of this land with a great multitude of narrow, sectarian, small seminaries, whatever exceptions there may be, here and there, to this general description. Very commonly these are the solitary schools in a village.

* See the Report of the Wesleyan Committee on Education, December, 1872. Published by the Wesleyan Conference Office, 1873 (last page).

The Wesleyan Committee proposes to take effectual dealing with these; either they must accept the Conscience Clause, or they must vanish in the public account. On the ground of unsuitableness, they must be discounted from the roll of "efficient" schools. It appears to me that this demand is not only reasonable but necessary, that it is justified by the Vice-President of the Council's own definition of what he understands by the suitableness of a school. In a letter to the Honorary Secretary of the Worcester Diocesan Board of Education, dated August 8th, 1870, Mr. Forster uses the language I now quote:—

"Efficient and suitable provision will be held to be made for a district, when there is efficient elementary school accommodation within a reasonable distance of the home of every child who requires elementary instruction, of which he can avail himself on payment of a fee within the means of his parents, without being required to attend any religious instruction to which his parents object."

The requirement made by the Methodist Committee is in strict harmony with this language used by the equitable Vice-President.

But there is another branch of this question. Who is to guarantee the continued efficiency, regarded merely as schools of elementary instruction, of these schools —which, on a certain somewhat loose inspection, were pronounced "efficient" two years ago? Many of them, there can be no doubt, were only in a very humble sense efficient. All of them are liable to degenerate. Should not School Boards, by means of their local inspectors, be responsible for the continued "efficiency" of these schools? The dread of adding too heavily to the rates will be sure to prevent the

Board inspector from being too stringent in his requirements. The Wesleyan Committee would also, and with evident propriety, constitute the School Boards the guardians of the parishioners in regard to the Conscience Clause and its observance in these schools. By being invested with such functions, the dignity and value of the Board could not but be greatly increased.

Not content with thus developing the power and character of the District Boards, the Wesleyan Committee propose to give the Boards certain functions also in reference to inspected schools within their districts. Of course the methods and results of instruction in such schools are absolutely in the hands of her Majesty's inspectors of schools and of the National Department of Education. But the Government inspector only pays a passing visit to the school once or twice a year, and in the interval the managing committee—which is often negligent, and which cannot in any sense represent the public—is the only body which has any sort of authority in the school. The Wesleyan Committee propose that, "inasmuch as the School Boards are responsible for compelling the attendance of children at such elementary schools, inspected or "efficient," as exist within the respective School Districts, it ought to be within the competency of such Boards to take cognisance of the sanitary condition of such schools, of the general manner in which they are conducted, including, in particular, the observance of the Conscience Clause, both in its letter and spirit, and of any complaints as to these points which may be made by parents of scholars, and to make representations accordingly to the school managers or the Education Department,

or to both of these authorities, as the case may require."

By these proposals the District Board would be raised to a position of great service and responsibility. Even where its own schools might be very few—or if there were no Board Schools—its functions would be important and extensive. It would have something more to do than—as would often under the unamended Act be the case, if School Boards became general—merely to compel children to attend school, whilst without any charge, authority, oversight, or power in any respect, with regard to the schools to which they make their children go. In the way indicated by these proposals the needful requirement of local organization and responsibility, combined with decentralisation to a certain extent, would be accomplished. It seems desirable, indeed, that, in certain respects, our English system should be yet more highly organized than has now been indicated. The French educational economy, in the manner of combining, harmonising, and mutually limiting, the action or responsibility of the town or the commune, the province, and the national centre, appears to be most ably planned and adjusted. Of course all the parts of the French mechanism are too much under the control and manipulation of officials nominated by the Government. But this fact does not affect the symmetry and excellence of the plan, so far as respects the points to which I have referred. If, however, we cannot as yet see our way to county or provincial circles of education, or to the interposition in some way, between the School Board Districts and the Government centre, of large territorial divisions for educational purposes, let us at least have, with as little

delay as possible, District School Boards universally established and placed in relation with all existing public or quasi-public schools of primary education.

I have nothing to say in respect to the 25th clause of the Act, regarded apart from the 17th. The merely sectarian outcry about the former of these clauses may be left to die out, as it has almost done. I may say that the principle of these two clauses, to pay or to remit the fees of indigent scholars, according to circumstances, is old enough, and has been acted upon, without creating any bitterness or any difficulty, both on the Continent generally and also in Australia. But in this country the operation of these clauses was first of all assailed and interrupted by an outbreak of sectarian animosity against the sect which possessed the great majority of the schools, and has since been impeded by the much more serious, the permanent and truly formidable, difficulty which arises from the character and influence of our national pauperism. Public opinion seems to be settling fast to the conclusion that, as respects these two clauses, the English Education Bill should have been framed as the Scottish Education Act, on the motion of Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P. for Westminster, was, in the discussion, so amended as to stand; that is to say, that all cases of alleged inability to pay for the education of children should be referred to the Poor Law Guardians to investigate, and, if proper, to relieve by payment of the fee to the school to which the children are sent.*

* Scottish Education Act, 69th Section. See Appendix D at the end of the volume. Since the text was in type, Mr. Forster's Amendment Bill has been introduced, which concedes the principle of the Scotch Act, but, inconsistently, leaves the 17th clause in the Act. Probably this will be remedied in Committee.

Cases of alleged poverty are of two classes ; there are those delicate and deserving cases, which it is every way fit and most desirable to meet by voluntary aid and private charity ; and there are those which, because of the unworthiness, or, if not unworthiness, the coarse commonness of the indigent families, or because of the grave extremity, and (in either alternative) of the probable permanence, of the indigent necessity, ought to be relieved out of the public poor-rates. Now the School Boards are not adapted to investigate and discriminate between the merits of the vast crowds of cases which are sure to come before them as soon as ever it is made known that they are prepared to provide gratuitous education for needy families. Plausible, seductive mothers, who know well how to dress up their cases, will come in troops before the Board Committees, to obtain immunity from payment of fees. The money saved will be some inducement ; the pleasure of pleading a successful suit before the gentlemen of the Board, or of the Board's Local Committee, will be a yet stronger inducement. To many plausible, talking women of the least meritorious sort, the opportunity of stating a case before a board of gentlemen is an exciting variety in life ; it is a sort of public appearance, and it affords scope for ingenuity and the gift of speech. This is the case, more or less, everywhere, but especially in London. The two organizations which are thoroughly fitted for the work of investigation are the Charity Organization Society and the Board of Poor Law Guardians. All cases which it is possible to suppose may be fit and worthy cases for wise charity should be remitted to the voluntary Society for investigation, and by means of that Society, and its connec-

tions, provided for, if found worthy. Under such circumstances, with such an important and recognised part to play in the beneficent regulation of charitable effort and of the education of the poor, the Charity Organization Society would never want funds. I can imagine few things more valuable than that it should be linked with such a public department as the School Board. Cases rejected by this Society as unworthy of special charitable aid, and all cases which are evidently, on the face of them, unworthy, or coarsely common, or likely to be grave and permanent, should be remitted for investigation to the guardians of the poor. It is their business to test poverty, to sift applications for relief, to detect and reject cases of imposition. Such a business requires great and special knowledge and experience, and special agents and organization. The Poor Relief Department already possesses all these ; the School Boards have them not, and are not organized to obtain them. Are they to become a second Poor Relief Department ? are they to add this to their other functions ? Unity, consistency, economy, all demand that the work of legal investigation should all be done by the authorities whose chief and proper task it is to do such work. The Scottish Education Act makes provision for this. I cannot doubt that the English Act should be amended in the same sense.

In several points of detail the compulsory provisions under the Act are seriously defective, and must certainly be amended, especially as to the evidence which is to be held admissible against a parent. But I shall not enter upon such points of detail. I think it more important, with my lessening space, to say that, without indirect legislation to

sustain and encompass the direct compulsory provisions of the Act, the work of direct compulsion can never be accomplished. As yet no thorough work of compulsion has been accomplished, even in London; in many large towns compulsion is as yet but a threatening word. The mere word and threat will soon cease to inspire awe. Where, as in some parts of London, attempts are being made really to carry out compulsion, the parents will soon find out the loose meshes in the Act and the bye-laws, and will sometimes be able to defy, and sometimes to evade, the Board's attempts at prosecution. It may be feared lest, in this respect, matters may probably be worse rather than better in twelve months' time. The attendance at the London Board schools shows that the most important part of compulsion, which is to secure *regular* attendance, is as yet an utter failure. The absentees at the Board schools, on an average, number forty per cent., a degree of irregularity much beyond that of voluntary schools.

So things are, in my judgment, likely to remain, unless large and comprehensive measures of indirect legislation are brought in to supplement and sustain direct compulsory legislation. In the language of one of the suggestions of the Wesleyan Committee, "the principles of the Factory, Factory Extensions, and Workshops' Regulation Acts ought to be applied to all classes of children employed in labour," and "no child or young person should be allowed to work either half time or full time without having, in either case, passed an appropriate examination, in a manner satisfactory to one of her Majesty's inspectors of schools." I know perfectly well that even this supplementary legislation would prove to

have its leakages, its very wide and loose meshes, and could not always be applied; but it would greatly help, both morally and by its direct legal pressure. We need all manner of helps and aids to get the work done. Where one Act fails, another may succeed. The indirect legislation would cause a large part of the community to learn that, in order to get benefit from their children's labours, they must secure their children's education. The leaven of such a lesson would operate most beneficially in influencing the whole population. The London Board, and other Boards, have acted on this principle in their bye-laws. The principle ought to be embodied and enforced as statute law for the whole land.

When all is done, however, that law and administration can do, many children will still be unreached. Berlin, Hamburg, New York, agree to teach us this lesson. In the "lowest deep" that School Boards can reach, there will still be found "a lower deep." "There will still remain"—I close with the weighty words of the Wesleyan Committee—"a large number of vagrant and neglected children—the very class which most urgently needs Christian help and educational elevation—whose case can only be met by the efforts of voluntary philanthropy, assisted, under proper regulations, by grants from public funds."

My space will not allow me to deal in detail with the case of Scottish education or the Education Act for Scotland. The ancient parochial system provided excellently for the wants of Scotland, until the huge

growth of modern towns had made it inadequate for such towns. The teachers, also, it must be said, though frequently excellent, were not seldom of antique style ; while the fact that the appointment of parish schoolmaster was regarded as a man's right for life, and was a post indeed from which an incompetent or unsuitable teacher could only with difficulty be removed even by legal process, led to the retention in office as parochial schoolmasters of not a few most improper persons. Under the Privy Council Administration Scotland had been admitted to the same benefits as England, and, more fortunate and more resolute than England, had never been obliged, as to several important points, to submit to the special regulations introduced by the Revised Code in 1862. It had successfully contended against the levelling principle of payment on the mere basis of the "Three R's." The Privy Council had done much for the whole country, but much especially for the large towns. Religious and ecclesiastical distinctions had never interfered greatly with education in Scotland. All classes of schools strictly respected the consciences of parents. Roman Catholic children went in great numbers to Presbyterian schools. The Presbyterian schools of the various denominations, constituting the immense majority of schools in the country, were undistinguishable from each other by any sign or token in their teaching or management. In all these schools the same doctrine was taught, the same catechism—the shorter catechism of the Westminster Assembly—was learnt by the children, the same school methods were in use. The establishment of a national primary system, under such circumstances, was a task free from many

difficulties which beset the case of national education in England.

The new system inaugurated by the Act of 1872, builds on the old foundations, on the parochial schools, throughout all the country, especially the agricultural parts, and on the denominational schools under the Privy Council. "The Scotch Education Act," says Lord Napier and Ettrick, "comprises three capital features; a general system of local (Scottish) management, a general rate, and universal obligatory attendance. It is complete and absolute where the Act for England is partial and facultative. These provisions are, however, raised upon an old basis, and could not have been established without it; the School Board is a transformation of the heritors' meeting; the rate is an expansion of the former charge upon the land; and the rule of compulsion has been adopted in deference to the demand of public opinion, trained by religion and prudence to recognise the obligation of the parent to provide for the education of his child."*

In Scotland the School Boards are under no restriction as to what religious instruction shall be given in their schools. As a matter of fact, it is universally understood that, with very few, if any exceptions, School Board schools will be conducted precisely as all Presbyterian schools, of whatever variety, have heretofore been conducted, that the Bible and the Westminster Catechism will be taught in them. One consequence of this will be the immediate transfer to the School Boards of the great bulk of the schools belonging to the various denomi-

* Address at the opening of the annual meeting of the Social Science Association at Plymouth, 1872.

nations. The Established Kirk, under the old law, had virtually the control of the parochial schools. These will now be transferred to the School Boards, in conformity with the new law. The inducement to other Presbyterian denominations, after this, to maintain separate schools will be small indeed. All they want is to be found at the Board School. The denominations may, however, if they see good, still retain their schools under the Privy Council, and apart from the Scottish educational centre. The few Episcopalian schools, or a considerable proportion of them, and the Roman Catholic schools, may still be so retained, the latter, perhaps, permanently.

Though there will be a general school rate through the country to meet needful expenses, the Scottish schools will not be free. The principle of free education, indeed, has never found favour in Scotland.

There is one very special feature in the Scottish Bill. The School Boards have power, when this may appear needful or very convenient, in order to meet the case of small and detached populations, to take under inspection and to aid with grants on examination, private elementary schools, whether denominational or otherwise.

I have already, in writing of the English Act, referred to the principle of educational relief for the poor in Scotland. In applying compulsion, the parochial boards will co-operate with the School Board, so far as to investigate and to charge themselves with the payment of fees, in all cases of indigence calling for pecuniary aid. It is also made penal for employers of labour to have children in their employment, between certain ages, who have not obtained a certain modicum of education.

It is evident that, under the operation of this measure, primary education in Scotland will soon attain to a high degree of unity and consolidation. Scotland has always been one of the best-educated countries in Europe. It may be expected that, before long, it will more than rival Germany, Switzerland, or Holland.*

But the national school education of Scotland, as of England and of Ireland, cannot be effected—could not een be organized—on the secular principle. Compulsory and universal secular education is repudiated by common consent throughout the three kingdoms of our empire.

* In Appendix D at the end of the volume the chief distinctive provisions of the Scotch Act are given, and also of the New Code, which materially varies from the English Code.

*** Since the foregoing pages were in type, Mr. Forster's small but judicious Education Act Amendment Bill for England has been introduced into Parliament. So far as it goes, it is in harmony with what I have written. It provides for the compulsory education, at the expense of the rates, of all out-door pauper children, numbered now, it appears, at nearly 200,000. (Cf., p. 324.) It deals with clause 25 on right principles and improves the law as to evidence of absence from school. Probably more could not have been wisely attempted at present. No one knows better than Mr. Forster that much more ought to be done.

CHAPTER XI.

A FORECAST OF THE FUTURE.

LET us first try to understand what permanent form public elementary education will have assumed in this country in the nearer future of ten years to come.

I assume that pupil-teachers will remain as a permanent feature in our English popular system, although, for reasons indicated in the eighth chapter, I think it may be taken for granted that the age of apprenticeship will have advanced from thirteen to fourteen.

We are bound also to assume that the regulation will, after next spring, be carried into effect, of which the Government have now a second time given notice, by which the proportion of pupil-teachers in all large schools will be materially reduced, assistant-teachers being substituted for them in the ratio of one assistant for two pupil-teachers, so that there never shall be more than four pupil-teachers to one certificated master or mistress in any school; an assistant-teacher being required either to be certificated or to have completed a term of pupil-teachership, or, not having been a pupil-teacher, to have passed a "Queen's Scholarship" examination, such as qualifies for entrance to a Training College.

I assume, further, that, as now, the schools being examined by Government inspectors every year, the standards of examination will be graduated for six successive years, six years (from seven to thirteen) being the full term of school attendance which it is hoped will be kept by the children after leaving the infant-school. I presume, moreover, that so long as Government grants are made on examination "passes," it will be considered a needful safeguard against the repeated presentation of the same children in the same standard in successive years, and a necessary guarantee of real progressive education, that the children should be presented for examination year by year in successive standards according to their age; although such a mechanical rule of uniformity is in itself quite indefensible. I dismiss as not deserving criticism, and as a curious instance of the slavish copying of German faults and shortcomings as if they were merits, the suggestion recently thrown out at a very small "Conference" on Education at the Society of Arts, that the six standards should be reduced to three. Such a step would be a distinct retrogression, and could only lead to inefficiency and confusion.

I assume, further, that, except in the case of schools for special classes—as, for instance, for ragged or semi-criminal children—and of village schools, large schools of several hundreds will be the rule, and small schools, schools of less than 150, the exception; that junior schools, for children from seven to ten, will often be "mixed," but senior elementary schools, for children from ten to thirteen, seldom or never; but yet that, among the schools frequented by children of the superior artisan and the small shop-

keeper classes, especially superior voluntary schools, there will often be found excellent mixed schools, for children of all ages, except infants ; that, to sum up, in the large towns a group or system of schools will most commonly consist of three departments, for infants, for boys, and for girls, but that it will sometimes consist only of two, an infants' and a mixed school ; while, on the other hand, it will sometimes, especially when the number of children provided for is very large (from 1,000 to 1,500), include four departments—viz., infants, junior mixed, senior boys and senior girls, or even five, viz., infants, junior boys, junior girls, senior boys, and senior girls.* Of course, when a mixed school is under a master, a sewing mistress for the girls will be necessary, to attend on certain afternoons each week. In the case of village mixed schools I anticipate that, before long, female teachers will generally be employed, as being both cheaper and better adapted for the work. The village school will often be the only school for both sexes and all ages, including infants. For such a school a mistress will evidently be much more suitable than a master. When the village is populous enough to sustain two schools, an infants' and a mixed school, the mixed school is not likely to be large, nor the boys to require advanced instruction, and a vigorous and able mistress will both cost less and do better than such a master as alone would be likely to be obtainable for a small village school.

I do not at this moment touch on the question of School Boards or Board Schools in the future, nor

* I print, in Appendix C, the Educational Scheme of the London School Board.

shall I attempt to guess in what proportions the rate-built and the voluntary schools will co-exist. But, apart from any such questions, it appears to me that in the near, though not perhaps the nearest future—some ten years hence, I would say—our school arrangements will have taken some such form as the following :—In *large* schools the teacher and assistant-teacher will probably both be certificated, and thus the number of certificated teachers to be kept up by supplies from the Training Colleges will be considerably larger than the number of public elementary schools, although, perhaps, not larger in proportion to the number of children under instruction than it is now, inasmuch as the average number of children attending each school will be much larger than at present ; large schools will be the rule, the school will often be very large, and small schools will be the exception. The number of pupil-teachers coming forward from the schools to the colleges will have fairly adjusted itself to the demands of these colleges, which, in their turn, will supply a stable proportion of teachers yearly to meet the settled and solid demand of the country. As an ordinary rule, the student who has completed his two years' term of training at college will not be placed at once in charge of a large school, but will either obtain a small school, or be placed as an assistant in a large school. Then, again, as small schools are likely gradually to be greatly reduced in number—even in villages the one school for infants, boys, and girls, under an able trained mistress, with a female ex-pupil-teacher to take charge of the infants, being likely to supersede the two schools, under a master and mistress respectively, which are

now so common—it appears probable that, before many years are over, nearly all students who have completed their training at college will proceed to continue their training, in a sense, and to acquire experience, as assistants under experienced teachers in large schools. This result, which I see distinctly rising into view at no great distance, will tend to meet one of the objections most frequently alleged against our present system, namely, the immaturity of the teachers who go forth, at twenty years of age, often to undertake the responsible task of conducting a large school, and of both teaching and training scores of young individualities, quick and teeming centres of personal faculty and power, of feeling, and energy, and influence.

Not only, moreover, under the regulations and adjustment which I seem thus to foresee, will students, by adding to their training, as pupil-teachers and in college, the further training and experience gained by them as assistants in large schools, be much better fitted to enter upon the ultimate responsibilities of their profession, but also in each separate school, the proportion of age and experience brought to take charge of the responsible task of training the young will be largely increased. Instead of one chief teacher and five or six pupil-teachers to a school of 250 children or upwards, there will in such a school be two responsible teachers of some proved competency, not only as to power of instruction, but trustworthiness in training, assisted by three or four pupil-teachers. It is generally understood, indeed, that the Education Department intend, as soon as circumstances will allow, still further to increase the proportion of as-

sistant teachers; so that, ultimately, no one certificated teacher shall have more than from 120 to 160 children under his charge, without having a qualified assistant.

Here, however, a question arises as to the supply of trained teachers in the future to do the work of public elementary education. Parliament has determined that the people shall be educated, and has taken measures for providing the requisite number of schools. But without trained and able teachers school-houses would be of little use. The new Act has done nothing towards providing such teachers, although the number of inspected schools in the country may perhaps, before very long, be increased by one-half. What, then, are the prospects of our national education in that respect? This is a natural question to ask, and it is well that a satisfactory answer to it can be given.

For the purposes of the calculation I am about to make, Scotland may be taken along with England, the Government certificate running equally in both countries, and many teachers being interchanged between the two. The high orthodox calculation is that one in six of the population ought to be at school. If this were the case, Great Britain would be a thoroughly well school-educated island. This standard is unquestionably a high one, as compared with the school attendance of other countries. This, however, is inclusive of all schools and of all children. Of the half-time children two go for one in school attendance. The children at other than primary schools also, must be taken into account in any estimate made of the number of children in the country to be reckoned as school attendants at public

elementary schools. In calculating, moreover, the actual number to be taught at one and the same time in the primary schools of the kingdom, it will be necessary to make a further subtraction—besides the allowance on account of children in secondary schools, or private schools, or taught at home, and on account of half-timers—for those who are absent because of sickness or for other necessary reasons. In every large school a certain average discount on attendance must always be reckoned upon from such causes, even under a compulsory *régime*. The sum of the deductions on all these various accounts will certainly not be over-estimated if it is set down at twenty-five per cent. Allowing this deduction, the actual number of children to be provided for, as able to be present at one time in the public primary schools of the kingdom, will be reduced to one in eight instead of one in six. Or, in other words, if one in six are to be under regular instruction in some way or other, one in eight ought to be in actual attendance in public elementary schools. Practically, indeed, this reduced estimate is altogether excessive, because it supposes that, except private or secondary schools, all others will be inspected primary schools, under certificated teachers, *i.e.* "public elementary schools" in the sense of the Education Act. Any such result as this can certainly not be anticipated as likely to come about within any assignable period in the nearer future, if it should ever come about, which to me, I confess, seems more than doubtful. Pure voluntaryism in education, and free educational enterprise, will die very hard, if they die at all I hope and believe they will never die. However, I am content for the purpose of my present calculation to

take the number of children in actual attendance to be provided for at one in eight. One in eight is Sir James Kay Shuttleworth's estimate.

The population of Great Britain at the last census was 26,072,284. One-eighth of this number will be very nearly 3,260,000. Let us allow one certificated teacher for 120 children on an average; the number of teachers required—required, let it be observed, in the far future towards which our educational system is supposed by some to be moving, when there shall no longer be any uninspected National School or other voluntary quasi-public elementary school, and when all private elementary schools, for the working classes, shall have been done away—the total number required will be 27,166. If we take the wear and tear of the profession, at what appears to be the proper proportion for the future, when retirements from the profession will be much less frequent than in the past, viz. six per cent., the number of teachers needed yearly to fill up vacancies by death and retirement will be 1,630. At seven per cent. for wear and tear the number needed would be 1,900. At the present time the number of certificated teachers is 17,377; it seems hard to imagine an increase within the next ten years of more than fifty per cent., which would bring the number up to 26,065. It must be remembered that the average number of children in attendance at each school will be much larger in the future than in the past. Small schools with fewer than 150 children will be comparatively rare. On the whole, it cannot well be doubted that in any working estimate as to the number of inspected teachers likely to be needed at any time for which we could now prudently attempt

to forecast a calculation—ten years to come would seem to be about the limit of such a time—27,000 would be a liberal estimate. After five years have passed away, there will probably be little building of new schools for many years, and whatever increase there may be in the number of schools and teachers thereafter needed may be expected to arise very gradually, so gradually as to be met by the natural growth of the teacher supply. Of course the population will be continually increasing; but this may be left out of account in our present calculation, both because there will beyond doubt be much overbuilding at first, and because colleges and all things naturally grow with increase of population and national dimensions and resources. Let us now recur to the calculations already made. At six per cent. the wear and tear of 27,000, or, to be exact, 27,166, teachers will be 1,630, at seven per cent. 1,900, a most ample allowance for the next dozen years.

Now from what sources will this supply have to be met? By no means only from Training Colleges. I have pointed out that there are and will be, as there ought to be, two ways of entering the profession, one through the Training Colleges, usually, but not necessarily, after apprenticeship, the other by apprenticeship and assistantship, or by "Queen's Scholarship" (Training College Entrance) examination and by assistantship, there being a final examination (for certificate) between assistantship and full rating as a certificated teacher, whether in the capacity of chief teacher or still as an assistant (but now also certificated) teacher. A large percentage of the pupil-teachers are now entering the profession by this avenue; and

the number of those who so enter is likely to be permanently large in future.

Taking these figures and calculations into account, nothing surely can well be more certain than that a Training College supply of certificated teachers amounting yearly to 1,600 or 1,700 at present, and capable, without any serious difficulty, of being gradually augmented in a few years to 2,000, would more than meet the requirements of public elementary schools for Great Britain. Several hundreds a year additional might be safely counted on as coming into the profession by way of apprenticeship, assistantship, and examinations. The total supply, from the first, could scarcely be less than 2,000 a year, and would probably be much greater. It would soon rise to several hundreds more than this. The number of students who left the Training Colleges last Christmas was about 1,600, besides several hundreds of ex-pupil-teachers who took charge of small schools or became assistants. The supply of teachers has, during the current year, been in excess of the demand. Teachers have not been able to find schools!

No doubt the number that left the Training Colleges last Christmas was somewhat larger than it would otherwise have been, because of an exceptional permission granted to Training Colleges by the Education Department, to send out at the Christmas of 1870, 1871, and 1872, students of only one year's training into schools. This was a provision intended to meet the special and initial pressure for teachers arising out of the demands suddenly created by the new Act. The indulgence, however, came to an end last Christmas; and, in

future, the old-rule will obtain. As a rule, all teachers will be trained for two years, except such as have received a special training as infant-school mistresses. With this exception, Government will make no grant in aid of the expense connected with the training of any teacher, unless such teacher shall have been resident and under training two years at the Training College. Still, the number of trained students who will leave the various Training Colleges next Christmas will certainly not be less than 1,700, as several colleges have lately been built or enlarged.* Some also are now in course of building or enlargement. For some years to come, accordingly, we may look for a still increasing number of trained teachers to issue from the colleges. The 1,700 will probably soon rise nearly to 2,000.

A few years ago it was thought by some that Government would have to take some special step in order to provide the needful permanent supply of Training Colleges and of teachers under training. It is now evident that there is no such necessity. Additions, as I have said, are now being made to our Training College provision and capacity. But, apart from such additions, the number of trained teachers now issuing each Christmas from the colleges would, in combination with the other source of supply, through apprenticeship and assistantship, more than suffice, if all the country were already, once for all, supplied with schools and teachers, to keep up the supply from year to year. There are far more than enough of pupil-teachers, also, coming forward, apart from all others who might desire to enter the profession, to

* A year ago the colleges were capable of providing for 3,336 students.

keep the colleges full. Indeed, the altogether excessive force of pupil-teacher candidates pressing for admission to the Training Colleges—candidates who have completed their apprenticeship as pupil-teachers —would, if it were to continue from year to year, be a serious inconvenience. At present this excessive supply is absorbed, as I have intimated, in special ways. Pupil-teachers who have completed their apprenticeship are admissible, instead of certificated teachers, immediately to take charge of small schools with fewer than sixty scholars. Many of the existing certificated teachers of such schools being at present needed to meet the demand for teachers to supply the new schools opened throughout the country, the ex-pupil-teachers come in conveniently to fill up the vacancies in the small schools. Certificated assistant-teachers, also, who become principal teachers, have their places often supplied in a similar way. The former of these two resorts for pupil-teachers at the end of their apprenticeship must, however, soon come nearly to an end. But the proportion of pupil-teachers who have completed their apprenticeship to college vacancies, and to the yearly demand for trained teachers, will be greatly changed, and will probably be permanently rectified, by the alteration in the Government regulations of which I have spoken, and by which, in all large schools (schools of 240 or upwards), the number of pupil-teachers will, in future, not be allowed to exceed four to one certificated teacher; but assistant-teachers, either certificated teachers or ex-pupil-teachers, will have to be employed instead of any additional number of pupil-teachers. If, besides, the minimum age of a pupil-teacher, when apprenticed, should be raised to fourteen, and the appren-

ticeship reduced to four years instead of five, premature apprenticeship of children not likely to do well in the profession will be less likely to occur than heretofore.

So far as respects the permanent demand, accordingly, we may take it as a settled point that the existing colleges will prove sufficient to supply the schools of the kingdom with teachers. Moreover, if there were likely still to be any deficiency, there can be no doubt that it would be met by the further erection or the enlargement of colleges. The Church of England has its eye on the future, and has not by any means exhausted its powers of extension. Neither is the ability or the disposition of the Wesleyan Methodists to increase their college training capacity and power as yet exhausted. The British and Foreign Society, although they have greatly enlarged their means during the last two years, are competent to do more yet. All denominations, indeed, both in England and Scotland, appear to be able to do their full part, and combinedly to make an ample provision for the denominational wants of the country. Nor can it be said that an altogether undenominational provision is still wanting, because the large colleges of the British and Foreign Society are undenominational. Under these circumstances there seems to be no need for the Government to interpose. There is a sufficient provision, and a provision of every sort that is required. If any particular denomination deems its own wants to be inadequately met, there can hardly be any serious difficulty, during the present dispensation of Government aid—Government finding nearly three-fourths of the annual expense—in providing whatever additional accommodation may be

thought necessary. At all events, there can be no case for Government outlay. Some have imagined that Government would find it necessary to provide a secular Training College. But such a college would be altogether impracticable, except as a Day Training College. The Government could not set up a large family, under an express bond and covenant that all religion and worship should be ignored within its enclosure. A Day Training College in London, moreover, would be very expensive to the students, very difficult to work, and, in every sense, a hazardous experiment. Nor would the difficulties in the way of such a college be much less considerable in Manchester, Liverpool, or any other large English town. There are boarding-out or Day Training Colleges in Scotland. But Scotch domestic habits, Scotch family ways, and Scotch towns are very different from English. The classes, also, from which the teachers come have, up to the present time, been very different. Neither have Scotch schools to do precisely the same work for villages and villagers as English schools. Throughout the Continent Normal Schools or Training Colleges are always true *collegia*, where the students are boarded and watched over as a family. Teachers who are to train need to be trained. It is impossible for the work of training to be powerfully done upon the teachers, unless they live together as a family. The English youths who come up as pupil-teachers to be trained for their work greatly need to be trained *en famille*, morally and Christianly. I feel persuaded that, as a rule, it would be better for the candidate not to be trained in a college at all, but to finish his preparation for the work of teacher by acting as assistant to other teachers, rather than to

attend college as an out-boarder. Many are now trained for the work in the work, first as pupil-teachers and then as assistants, without going to college at all. In general, however, the two years' consecutive training at college develops powers and points of character in a far more thorough and effectual manner than can be done simply by practice in schools, together with a senior teacher's instruction and aid.

I cannot conceive, accordingly, of any satisfactory or permanent supply of Training Colleges for public service, except what is based originally upon voluntary effort and provision, and is conducted by means of voluntary management. Believing, as I do, moreover, for reasons which have already been stated, that eventually even Training Colleges, although not by any means so soon as elementary schools, must become self-supporting, it appears to me the more certain that they can only stand upon a voluntary basis.

But the question here arises whether permanently in the future, and especially after Government bounties shall have been withdrawn, there is likely to be a supply forthcoming of teachers for our elementary schools. So long as the Government bounties last, indeed, at their present rate, there can be little doubt that the supply will last. Of course, the question of the supply of teachers depends mainly—perhaps, as respects quantity as distinguished from quality, depends almost wholly—on the pecuniary inducement held out. If the salary of teachers is likely to remain as good in the future as in the past, there can be little doubt that the supply will continue. Probably it will increase, because the profes-

sion is rising in public estimation. The only doubt, therefore, is, whether the payment will in future be as good as in the past, as good both positively and also in comparison to the general rates of payment in the various crafts and professions of the country.

There can be no doubt as to the nearest future, —the next four or five years. During this period the colleges will barely be able to meet the demand for teachers. It is true that at the present moment the supply of teachers exceeds the demand, and that there were many scores who left the colleges last Christmas who could not find employment. But the reason of that is that, thus far, very few comparatively of the new schools have been built and opened. At the beginning of 1871 the anticipation of a demand filled up the colleges, of which many had been previously half empty, so that the number leaving after two years' training last Christmas was very greatly in excess of former years. Meantime, many former teachers who had left the profession have during the last two years been returning to it. Many pupil-teachers, also, who had finished their apprenticeship, but were unable to enter colleges in 1871 and 1872, have, in the manner I have already explained, added to the amount of teaching power available by becoming assistants, or by taking charge of small schools. In this way an addition has been made during the last twelve months to the resources of the market for teachers, perhaps almost equal to doubling the former supply for any one year. Next Christmas several new colleges, which have been undertaken since 1870, will have begun to add their quota to the supply, and, as I have intimated, some other new ones will still further increase the number

in 1874 and 1875. Each year also some hundreds of pupil-teacher candidates who, although they have passed the Christmas entrance examination successfully, are unable to find admittance into the almost overfilled colleges, will swell the amount of distributable teaching power for the schools of the country. In these ways, some thousands of additional teachers beyond the former average supply will have been found available, during the next few years, to provide for the increased demand for teachers. It may well be doubted, nevertheless, whether they will be sufficient in number to meet the necessities of the case. The new schools, including Board and voluntary schools, may, perhaps, amount in number to 5,000. Then the requirement that, in all large schools, assistant-teachers, either certificated or such as have passed the Christmas college entrance (or Queen's Scholarship) examinations, shall be employed, will constitute a large additional demand on the yearly supply. I anticipate, accordingly, that during the next three or four years the supply of teachers will, on the whole, scarcely suffice to meet the demand, and consequently that the rate of payment will keep fully up to its present high mark. Taking all sources of income into account—except the grants from the Science and Art Department on account of children who pass the Science and Art examinations—the teachers' incomes may be said to range in London and other large towns, for good teachers of two or three years' experience after leaving college and upwards (the salary generally rising, though by no certain rule, up to ten or twelve years' experience), at from £150 to £300 for men, and from £90 to £160 for women. There is a certain, and not insignificant, proportion

of male teachers, whose incomes are considerably higher than the largest sum I have named. The grants from the Science and Art Department, also, sometimes add one-fourth or one-third to the teacher's income. As a class, accordingly, public elementary teachers at present are highly paid, while some make remarkably large incomes. The occupation of a clerk or cashier is, on an average, remunerated far less liberally. Clergymen, on an average, are not much better paid than elementary school teachers. At the same time, the access to the profession is easy, and exceedingly cheap. The pupil-teacher is paid moderately, indeed, but not meanly, for his services. The two years' instruction at the Training Colleges is absolutely free from charge, except, in some instances, an entrance fee of a few pounds, on an average not exceeding £5. Never was there so easy, so cheap, or so sure an avenue into a profession at once honourable, interesting, and lucrative—one in which a capable and careful teacher can hardly fail to do very well indeed.

It follows from these facts that we may expect, for some years to come, salaries to rule high in the profession of teacher, and a large supply of pupil-teachers to be coming forward to keep the colleges full. The large recent increase of pupil-teachers, indeed, will not, during the next few years, contribute anything to the supply of teachers required by the large and rapid increase of schools. That increase will have to be met from the sources I have indicated, which will probably hardly avail to satisfy the heavy demand. The increased number of pupil-teachers, apprenticed during the last two years and in following years, will come forward too late (not less than five years hence),

in their matured character of trained teachers, to be able to furnish any help towards relieving the extraordinary pressure of the next few years. When they are coming forward the pressure will be over. The ordinary yearly supply of trained teachers from the colleges, and by the way of assistantship and examination, will, as we have seen, in all likelihood be amply equal, after the next five years, to meet the yearly demand for teachers. Few new schools will be built; whatever increase there is will come forward very gradually. Six or seven per cent. on the number of certificated teachers in the profession will be the measure of the number of new teachers yearly required.

Meantime, the number of inspected schools in the country will have increased by, perhaps, one-half, and the number of children in inspected schools probably by much more than one-half. The result would naturally be a very large increase in the number of pupil-teachers in the coming educational period. But for the requirement soon to be insisted upon, and to which I have already more than once referred, by which the proportion of certificated and assistant teachers in large schools is to be increased and of pupil-teachers to be diminished, the number of pupil-teachers apprenticed in the schools must in a few years have risen to sixty per cent. in excess of what it was in 1870, and the number of fifth-year pupil-teachers desirous to enter Training Colleges would probably have much more than doubled. At Christmas last, the supply of pupil-teachers coming forward, at the end of their apprenticeship, with a view to enter the colleges, was greatly in excess of the capacity of the colleges to take them in, and was more than equal in number

to the supply required, in future, from year to year, to keep the colleges full, even after they shall have been enlarged and increased in number. It may be imagined, accordingly, what an increasing overflow of pupil-teacher supply for the colleges would be likely to come forward in years to come. The increased number and size of the schools will much more than compensate for the proportionate diminution in the number of pupil-teachers in large schools arising from the new rule, as to the proportion of pupil-teachers to certificated teachers, which is next year to come into force. The overflow of pupil-teacher candidates for the office of teacher will, indeed, for some years to come, probably be absorbed by the vacancies created through the building of new schools, and by the demand for assistant-teachers ; but when the new schools are all opened, the crowd of pupil-teachers who have finished their apprenticeship and desire to proceed with their professional training is likely, according to present appearances, to be far more than equal to meet the demand, not only of the colleges for students, but also of the schools for assistant or provisionally certificated teachers (of small schools). The avenues to the profession, it would seem, are likely to be blocked with candidates of whom a considerable proportion must be excluded and thrown into other employments. The effect of this state of things would naturally be, afterwards, to put a check on the influx of pupil-teachers into the schools. Probably, however, Government may, just as the pressure is coming to the worst, still further limit the proportion of pupil-teachers, and at the same time increase the minimum age at which they may be apprenticed, in accordance with what I have already intimated to be

desirable. If the lowest age of apprenticeship were to be fourteen, and the greatest number of pupil-teachers allowed to one certificated teacher were three, so that a school of 200 children should be taught by a certificated teacher, an assistant-teacher, certificated or a Queen's Scholar, and three pupil-teachers, probably the supply of pupil-teachers coming forward, Christmas by Christmas, to seek admission to the colleges, might about equal the demand.

Here it is proper to observe that the supply of pupil-teachers as candidates for the Training Colleges has not, till within the last year or two, been in excess of the number required to keep the colleges adequately attended, and to provide trained teachers for the schools, merely because a large proportion of the pupil-teachers have left the track of the profession at the end of their apprenticeship. The great change in this respect which the last two years have brought would of itself have been sufficient entirely to alter the proportions of supply and demand between pupil-teachers and Training Colleges.

The foregoing considerations have brought us, so far as respects the future supply of teachers for public elementary schools, to the following general conclusions. The supply of teachers will, for several years to come, be scarcely equal to the demand, and so the tendency of salaries will still be to rise; probably in four or five years from now the average salary will be considerably higher than it is at present. After those years have passed away—years of school-building and increase—the supply of teachers will be for some while in excess of the number of schools, and therefore there will be some fall of salaries generally. But the fall will not be fast or far. So long indeed

as Government grants are made on the present scale, on condition of an equal amount to the grant being raised by school fees and subscriptions together, the general average of school salaries must be maintained at a good level. It can never, whilst this lasts, fall again so low as it was before 1870; nor is it likely to fall much, if at all, lower than it is at present. With such a financial prospect for the profession, there can be no fear of the supply of teachers running short. It must not be forgotten, also, that the rise in the status of the school-teacher, consequent on the Act of 1870, and on the better general appreciation of the worth of education, is not likely to be affected by a limited fluctuation in salaries. The profession is permanently elevated in public esteem. One effect of this must be to attract into it a superior class of teachers. Up to the present time many who could have taught well, and who would have liked to teach our elementary system, and who could have done better for themselves financially in that way than any other, have yet kept aloof from the profession, because of certain feelings of social or caste prejudice; henceforth this prejudice must rapidly pass away, and many from well-bred families will seek to enter a profession which is not only lucrative, but is now recognised as honourable and "respectable."

If, indeed, we look far into the future, we see a change coming which might perhaps seem likely to affect the prospects of the profession. I have given my reasons for believing that one day Government maintenance grants to public elementary schools must come to an end. There may be prizes, exhibitions, inducements, open to all children and all schools; but there will be no maintenance grants available for

a certain class of schools. The question arises, how this change will affect the supply of teachers. It will certainly tend to render the profession of elementary school teacher more "respectable" and truly independent than ever; but will it affect the financial prospects of the profession so seriously as to reduce the supply and lower the professional standard and efficiency of school-teachers? I am inclined to answer this question in the negative.

It must be remembered, first of all, that this change, although I cannot doubt that it will come, will not come for many years, will come very gradually. Government has used the grant system as a mighty lever for elevating and extending the elementary education of the country, literary, commercial, and scientific. Before the grants begin to be reduced, the standards of examination must be raised higher than they have yet reached, both as respects teachers and scholars; school attendance, also, must become much more regular; in a word, the whole educational feeling and condition of the country, as regards both parents and children, teachers and taught, must be raised to a position equal to our national needs and proportionate to our national pre-eminence. When once such a result as this has been attained, and, along with this, schools of science and art, and effective and adequate connections between elementary and higher education, by means of exhibitions and otherwise, shall have been established, elementary education in England may be expected to learn to pay its own way. Grants may be gradually reduced, alike to all schools. Rates for Board schools may also be reduced until they are done away. Nearly all schools will be large schools,

at once economically and effectively organized. Parents will have learnt to value education. It has been no uncommon thing for the poor to pay, years ago, threepence, fourpence, and even sixpence a week, to miserably inefficient teachers, whether dames or not, for their children's schooling. The better sort of working people will think it no hardship to pay a somewhat higher sum for the thoroughly effective education of their children. There will be a large and valuable class of teachers, who have never been trained at college, indeed, but who have been apprenticed to the profession, have acted as assistants, and have passed a good examination; these teachers will be available and sufficient for smaller and somewhat humbler schools than the highly organized and superior town schools. These will often supply villages, especially female teachers of this class; and will also serve well as teachers of the most elementary schools for the lowest population in towns. Such a natural graduation of schools, with corresponding grades of teachers, would meet the wants of the people at prices varying for the weekly payment from threepence to ninepence. The cost would be low, the benefit out of all proportion to the cost. Such educational provision would be well within the means of the great majority of the working classes, both in town and country, as labour is likely to be paid after twenty years have passed away. If only they have in the meantime learnt frugality, there can be no doubt of the perfect ease with which, in general, the working classes will be able to pay the cost of such an education. If any really cannot pay for the good, cheaper education of which I have spoken, they must be so poor as to stand in need of public

relief. Nothing ought to be paid out of public rates or taxes directly towards the cost of education for any child, except on the principle of poor relief. This is the only ultimate solution of our educational problem to which we can come. Let the proper measures be adopted by which to dry up pauperism in general, such measures as those indicated in the earlier chapters of this volume, and the cure of pauperism, as a habit and institution of the English lower classes, will bring with it, will consist in the establishment of, a habit of provident frugality amply sufficient to put the English working parent almost universally into a condition in which he can easily pay for the schooling of his children.

When this has come to pass, candidates for the profession of teacher will be glad to pay for their own two years' training, and will find the results of such training amply remunerative. By that time, indeed, such a change may have been brought about in the home life and influences surrounding the humbler aspirant to the profession of school teacher, and at the same time so many of a superior grade in society may be glad to seek employment in a profession which is always more highly honoured in proportion as a nation becomes thoroughly educated, that it may be practicable to do in England what has been done, to some extent, with good success in better-educated and more steady Scotland; namely, to open Day Training Colleges for properly qualified students. The greater cheapness of this arrangement, for students or teacher candidates residing at their own homes, would go far to solve the question of cheap training and cheap teacher supply, which is, to a certain extent, equivalent to the supply of cheap teachers

—teachers cheap but good—especially for certain work. Training Colleges, on the family system, will always possess certain great advantages, especially for particular classes of students, and so will always command a supply of candidates.

National education, settled on such a basis as this, would be not only self-supporting but self-adjusting. The laws of free trade would, in a certain sense, begin under such conditions and in a nation thus enlightened and elevated, to apply to the question of national education. Demand would govern supply. Supply would answer to demand. There would no longer be any need of perpetual codes, old and revised and new and modified, eternally shifting and changing, to guide and shape the development of national education, in methods and standards, in supply and demand, in cost and price. This artificial system must come to an end some day. It can only be brought to an end on some such plan as I have indicated.

Some things, indeed, it will be necessary for the State to insist upon—that no child shall be put to partial labour who is not well, though partially, grounded in elementary education; and that no child shall be put to full labour who has not obtained a sound and effective elementary education; that no man shall have a vote who cannot read and write; that all candidates for public employment shall be required to pass an adequate examination. These and similar requirements will be necessary in order to keep up the standard of education. But if these matters be strictly attended to, elementary education among a thoroughly educated people may, after it has once been completely and effectively organized, be left

to take care of itself. At present, great as the benefits have been and are from the part Government has taken in the matter of education, every one must feel that the whole work lies much too absolutely in the hands of Government. We want a natural, universal, spontaneous, educational growth; institutions and tribunals, departments and boards, which, *though connected and united by the intermediation of some Government bureau,* nevertheless develop and regulate themselves, and are naturally influenced by each other. At present, all power is centred far too absolutely at the Council Office; dictation, judgment, determination, flow too despotically thence. It cannot be helped; it is the needful means, just now, to a better end. But it is in itself a most unattractive ideal; it cannot last or live very long.

Whatever changes may happen, it seems to me that School Boards will have a proper place and function, and that Board schools will be a valuable element among other schools. But such schools, as I have intimated, should, like all the rest, be self-supporting.

All this may read like a dream. Some may regard it as unpractical. To me, however, it seems that we cannot rest where we are, and consequently that we must determine what our principles are, and to what ultimate development they are to take us. Are we to allow the present system to work into a universal system of free education for all classes? If not, and I have shown in Chapter V. why I think this an altogether impossible alternative, then we must make up our minds to work into a self-supporting system. The present can only be justified as an exceptional and transitional condition of things.

I am not, indeed, sanguine as to the rate at which educational progress will proceed, whatever may be done, and under whatever system, so long as no revolution is brought about in the social condition of our operative classes; still less am I sanguine as to the results of any mere school education which may be given to the children of our lowest classes, so long as no such social revolution has taken place. How much social circumstances, rather than the mere supply or efficiency of elementary schools, have to do with the literary educational condition of the people, and how little the mere literary education of the people, up to certain limits, has to do with their comfort and independence as a class, might be strikingly and very instructively illustrated by a reference to the table of marriage-signature percentages, which is given in the late Census Report. What a notable fact it is that, while as we go northward the wages of the operative classes, speaking generally, and with their wages their independence and energy of character, largely increase, their literary capabilities, on an average, those of the women especially, rather diminish than increase. In slow Hampshire, the number of men who signed with a mark their marriage registers in 1870 was only 16·3 per cent., and of women only 14·6 per cent.; in Berkshire, the proportions were respectively 21·2 and 15·1; in Warwickshire, 22·5 and 28·8; in Staffordshire, 36 and 44·1; in Cheshire, 19·3 and 30; in Derbyshire, 20·5 and 26; in Yorkshire, 18·7 and 33·3; in Lancashire, 20·5 and 39·4; in Durham, 24·3 and 36·5. Poor Dorset is no worse than the percentages 21·2 and 18·6. Sussex shows very favourably, the percentages of complete illiteracy being only 16·8

and 13. Kent also shows very well, the percentages being 15 and 15·6. Oxford, not many years ago a very backward county, now shows very fairly, the percentages being 19·6 and 15. Cambridge has much improved, but, with most of the eastern counties, still lags a good deal behind, the percentages being 28·4 and 25. Bedfordshire shows strangely worse than Berkshire, its percentages being very large, 32·5 and 35·6 respectively. Buckinghamshire, intermediate in situation, is intermediate in its proportions, the percentages being 25·2 and 24·3. Essex shows 24·6 and 18·3; Norfolk, 29·5 and 23·6; Suffolk, 31 and 22·2. Lincolnshire is much better than these; the percentages are 17·7 and 17·2. The western counties are not quite so backward as the eastern counties, except where coal-mining and iron-mining have come in to make the ignorance darker. The percentages of Monmouthshire are 36·7 and 44·4. But Herefordshire shows 26·4 and 22·6; Worcestershire, 25·5 and 28; Gloucestershire (helped up by Bristol, Gloucester, and Cheltenham) rises to 17·8 and 19·2, a much better percentage than that of Yorkshire, largely made up as that county is of great towns, which ought to raise the general percentage very much, and especially a very much better percentage for the women. Somersetshire shows 22·3 and 21·3 per cent. Wiltshire is not bad, showing only, as percentages of illiteracy, 21·3 and 19·3. Poor despised Dorset we have already noted, the percentages being 21·2 and 18·6. Devonshire shows very fairly with its 17 and 19·4 per cent. Religious Cornwall shows to unexpected disadvantage, with its 23·9 and 29·3 per cent., the reason probably being that the girls and women are extensively employed in light labour

connected with mining operations. Altogether, the population of the western counties appears to contain a much smaller proportion of persons utterly illiterate than the central and northern counties lying between the Trent and the Tees.

I had occasion in Chapter II. to refer to the "statesmen," or independent yeomen of Westmoreland and Cumberland, and to the lead-miners of Cumberland, as classes of men who have helped to leaven those counties with a love of education. The neighbourhood of Scotland has, also, no doubt, helped to produce the same result in all the border counties, including, in particular, Northumberland. The intelligence and energy of our stalwart Northern peasantry, throughout all these counties, is well known. One is not surprised, accordingly, to find that all three stand well in the list. The percentages in Northumberland are for men 13·1, for women 23·2; in Cumberland they are 15 and 26·1; in Westmoreland 11·2 and 14·7. These figures in the case of Westmoreland are the more remarkable, because there is no populous, hardly a considerable town in the county, and the dwellings of the people are widely scattered. The purely agricultural county of Rutland shows well with its percentages of 14·5 and 10·9. Westmoreland and Rutland, apart from the metropolitan counties, may be considered the best educated counties in England. Metropolitan Surrey stands at the head of the entire list, the percentages being 9·2 and 12·3. Relatively, however, the level of this county must be considered as lower than that of either Rutland or Westmoreland. Metropolitan Middlesex can hardly be said to show well in comparison with its 9·4 and 14·8. But the operations of

the London School Board will, no doubt, soon make a decided change for the better in both counties.

It is evident that there are special causes which, in certain districts of the country, make the literary education of women better or worse, in comparison with that of women in other districts, or of men in the same district. Speaking generally, in agricultural districts, and especially in southern agricultural districts, the women will be found to be relatively "better spoken," and better able to read, often also better able to write, than the men. They are brought into more frequent contact with the better-educated classes, and they are much more at home with school-going children. In the south and south-midland counties of England the girls and women, by domestic service, at school, and in many other ways, are brought into frequent contact, often into habitual intercourse, with ladies of the gentle and educated classes. They thus become familiar with the language of civilised thought and of books, and learn themselves the practice of the pen in letter-writing. In remote counties, especially far north, where there are but few resident gentry, women have not this advantage, and so are often inferior in knowledge and education to the men, who have the business of life to do, and who belong to an able and well-to-do class of labourers. Accordingly, while in Kent the masculine percentage of ignorance is 15, and the feminine nearly the same, 15·6, in Northumberland the percentages are respectively 13·1 and 23·2, and in Cumberland 15 and 26.1. The much larger proportion of independent freeholders and small farmers in Westmoreland is probably the cause of the educational superiority of that county. In Berks, Buckingham, Cambridge, Dorset,

Essex, Hants, Hereford, Hertford, Huntingdon, Oxford, Rutland, Somerset, Suffolk, Sussex, Wilts, and Worcester, all purely agricultural counties, and most of them southerly or south-midland counties (little Rutland being an exception), the women stand better than the men. This is not the case in a single northern or manufacturing county.

There can scarcely be a doubt that the superior educational condition of Berks, in comparison of the counties to the east, west, and north, must be attributed to the very large number of resident gentry—families habitually resident for much the greater part of the year—that are to be found in that county. Kent enjoys an advantage of the same sort in its northern and western portions; it contains, besides, a large number of small towns, with superior educational advantages; it contains, also, a large proportion of independent small landowners, and thriving small farmers, and a labouring population in the receipt of superior wages. I do not know why Lincolnshire should be so much better than Bedfordshire. Perhaps the fact that much of the land has been reclaimed and brought into cultivation and proprietorship since feudal times may have something to do with it; perhaps the fact that Methodism has taken so strong a hold of a large portion of it may also have something to do with it. These two causes together may perhaps account in some degree for the superiority of Lincoln to the eastern counties generally, although, indeed, the former of the two applies more or less to other eastern counties besides Lincoln. The Methodists, too, have a good hold of a considerable portion of Bedfordshire. But I cannot help thinking, so far as Bedfordshire is concerned, that the straw-plait and

lace manufactures, keeping the children from school, and the women at other than domestic work, may be largely accountable for its educational condition.

Certain it is that the labour market, especially the manufacturing labour market, is everywhere the great competitor for the children against the school, and for the women against the home. It is no wonder, accordingly, that school education flourishes, as a rule, far better in agricultural than in manufacturing districts, taking into account the actual number, and especially the pecuniary ability, of the population. How lamentable is the census return for Lancashire! In only two English counties, Monmouthshire and Staffordshire, both of which are colliery and iron-working counties, are the women more ignorant than in highly favoured, industrious, opulent, intelligent, Lancashire. Nearly 40 per cent. of the women married in 1870 signed a mark to their register. Young women these, averaging perhaps twenty years of age, of whom it may be roundly said that all had been both to Sunday and day school, and of whom a large proportion had probably been half-time scholars for five years (from eight to thirteen) while working at the mill; and yet in seven years after leaving school they had lost all ready and fair power even of signing their own names. Of course, letter-writing for such must have been out of the question. The simple truth is, that for the seven years after their leaving school the mill or the pit had completely absorbed them for five days and a half of the week, and the remaining half day, with the Sunday, had been mostly given to sewing and mending (too little of that!), to marketing, to pleasure-taking, and to Sunday "recreation." Such a fact as this is ex-

ceedingly instructive as to the manner in which social conditions may make good school provision and regular school attendance for years of no effect. Beforehand it would never have been thought possible that any such condition of education should be predicable of the great county of Lancaster.

I am obliged, accordingly, to come back to the principles of my first chapter. It is good and needful to have good schools, and to enforce regular attendance; but even these things together will not be sufficient to raise up for England an educated people. The social conditions of the population must be revolutionised. At present the labour market acts antagonistically to education; it must be changed into an aid and an ally, by the requirement that no child shall go to labour for half time who is not well grounded in the earliest rudiments of education, nor for full time who is not thoroughly well instructed in what a citizen child ought to know. The roots of pauperism must be cut off by such measures as are indicated in my second chapter. The conditions of the rising and the grown-up labourer must be favourable to thrift, and include openings for suitable enterprise or investments. Only by such changes can the people of England become an educated people.

The friends of education and of the working classes have noted with the deepest satisfaction the Lord Chancellor's measures for facilitating the transfer of land, as laid now before the Parliament. Such measures as these will be the most efficient co-operators with schools and School Boards towards the education of the people. Without such measures all provisions of school education will prove ineffectual. How far educational compulsion can be actually ap-

plied to the classes which most deplorably need education remains yet to be proved. But even though school attendance should be more or less enforced upon them, ample evidence has, I submit, been brought forward in this volume to prove that, without a happy revolution in the social conditions under which parents and children live, the most neglected and the most deeply pauperised classes of English society cannot be really elevated. The percentages of illiteracy which I have quoted establish incontestably at least one conclusion, that the most pauperised counties in England are by no means the most illiterate. The counties lying between London and the south coast, and wide tracts of which have been demoralised by poverty, by smuggling, by poaching, by immemorial habits of servile dependence, by centuries of semi-starvation and physical depression, show far less of utter illiteracy than the well-fed and independent north-midland and northerly shires. School education, I must end by repeating, is only one among various elements necessary, and equally necessary, to the true education and elevation of a nation.

It will not be concluded from the statistical information which has now been under consideration, that the people of the south-midland and southern counties of England are well educated. There could, of course, be no greater mistake. All who are familiar with the social and intellectual condition of the population of those counties know how far otherwise is the actual state of the case. The schools in those counties are generally of a humble class; a large proportion of the village schools are not even inspected. Very few of the children even in the best schools advance to the higher school standards

in education. The children nearly all leave school at a very early age. It cannot be imagined, indeed, that the young men and younger girls who managed to sign their names when three years ago they were married, have many of them received any effective education whatever. It can hardly be doubted that many of the men, though they may have painfully performed their signature on this special occasion, will, before many years have passed away, have quite forgotten how to write, and indeed can scarcely be said to have possessed the general power of writing, although they could coarsely plough out their signature. In short, the power rudely to make a signature affords no presumption whatever that the person who makes the signature possesses any real education whatever; although, of course, the young person who, at this period of our nation's history, is unable to write even his or her own name may be presumed to be grossly ignorant of all general knowledge and destitute of civilising and elevating education. The wonder is not that so many in the southern and south-midland counties can barely write their names, but that so sadly large a proportion of young men and young women in the manufacturing and most of the northerly counties are unable even to write their names. It is evident enough that, in what I may speak of educationally as the "home counties," the counties of ancient civilisation and of a numerous resident gentry, the superior rudimentary education of the women, as compared with that of the women in the manufacturing and northerly counties, is not due either to school or to home influences, but to the habit of association, and in particular of domestic service, with the

families of the gentry on the part especially of the young women, and to other social influences of the better classes to which I have referred. These statistics throw remarkable and unwelcome light on the conditions of extreme and gross ignorance in different parts of the country, but they do not invalidate the conclusions attained in my earlier chapters. Considering how deeply pauperised are some of the very counties which show in these statistics less unfavourably than other counties, where there is less pauperism, and especially less habitual and hereditary semi-pauperism, these statistics strongly confirm my conclusion that "it is vain to hope that (mere) school education will bring pauperism to an end."

In particular, they go far to establish the point insisted upon first and last in this volume, that, to secure a true and thorough education of the people, adequate and well-grounded elementary attainments in school knowledge must be made the indispensable condition, in a lower degree, of employment as half-time workers, and, in a satisfactorily high degree, of employment as whole-time workers, at any wage-earning craft or occupation, for all children under the age of thirteen. In so far as this condition cannot be enforced, it becomes impracticable to secure the enforcement of an effective elementary education. Direct compulsion, apart from this requirement, will indeed be of considerable value, especially in dealing with the more accessible and amendable classes of working people. But the indirect requirement needs to be conjoined with the direct. Nor will direct and indirect together prove adequate to the necessities of the case, apart from such social reforms as are indicated in the two first chapters of this volume.

APPENDIX (A).

THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870.

THE title of the Act is "An Act to provide for public Elementary Education in England and Wales," or, shortly, "The Elementary Education Act, 1870."

After the definition of terms, the Act proceeds as follows:—

"(I.) LOCAL PROVISION FOR SCHOOLS.

School districts, &c. in schedule.

"4. For the purposes of this Act the respective districts, boards, rates, and funds, and authorities described in the first schedule to this Act shall be the school district, the school board, the local rate, and the rating authority.

"*Supply of Schools.*

School district to have sufficient public schools.

"5. There shall be provided for every school district a sufficient amount of accommodation in public elementary schools (as hereinafter defined) available for all the children resident in such district for whose elementary education efficient and suitable provision is not otherwise made, and where there is an insufficient amount of such accommodation in this Act referred to as "public school accommodation," the deficiency shall be supplied in manner provided by this Act.

Supply of schools in case of deficiency.

"6. Where the Education Department, in the manner provided by this Act, are satisfied and have given public notice that there is an insufficient amount of public school accommodation for any school district, and the deficiency is not supplied as hereinafter required, a school board shall be formed for such district and shall supply such deficiency, and in case of default by the school board the Education Department shall cause the duty of such board to be performed in manner provided by such Act.

Regulations for conduct of public elementary school.

"7. Every elementary school which is conducted in accordance with the following regulations shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act; and every public elementary school shall be conducted in accordance with the following regulations (a copy of which regulations shall be conspicuously put up in every such school); namely,

"(1.) It shall not be required, as a condition of any child being admitted into or continuing in the school, that he shall attend or abstain from attending any

Sunday school, or any place of religious worship, or that he shall attend any religious observance or any instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere, from which observance or instruction he may be withdrawn by his parent, or that he shall, if withdrawn by his parent, attend the school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs:

"(2.) The time or times during which any religious observance is practised or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school shall be either at the beginning or at the end or at the beginning and the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every schoolroom; and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parent from such observance or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school:

"(3.) The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's inspectors, so, however, that it shall be no part of the duties of such inspector to inquire into any instruction in religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book:

"(4.) The school shall be conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant.

"*Proceedings for Supply of Schools.*

Determination by Education Department of deficiency of public school accommodation.

"8. For the purpose of determining with respect to every school district the amount of public school accommodation, if any, required for such district, the Education Department shall, immediately after the passing of this Act, cause such returns to be made as in this Act mentioned, and on receiving those returns, and after such inquiry, if any, as they think necessary, shall consider whether any and what public school accommodation is required for such district, and in so doing they shall take into consideration every school, whether public elementary or not, and whether actually situated in the school district or not, which in their opinion gives, or will when completed give, efficient elementary education to, and is, or will when completed be, suitable for the children of such district.

Notice by Education Department of public school accommoda-

"9. The Education Department shall publish a notice of their decision as to the public school accommodation for any school district, setting forth with respect to such district the description thereof, the number, size, and description of the schools (if any) available for such district, which

tion required.

the Education Department have taken into consideration as above mentioned, and the amount and description of the public school accommodation, if any, which appears to them to be required for the district, and any other particulars which the Education Department think expedient.

"If any persons being either—

"(1.) Ratepayers of the district, not less than ten, or if less than ten being rated to the poor rate upon a rateable value of not less than one-third of the whole rateable value of the district, or,

"(2.) The managers of any elementary school in the district,

feel aggrieved by such decision, such persons may, within one month after the publication of the notice, apply in writing to the Education Department for and the Education Department shall direct the holding of a public inquiry in manner provided by this Act.

"At any time after the expiration of such month, if no public inquiry is directed, or after the receipt of the report made after such inquiry, as the case may be, the Education Department may, if they think that the amount of public school accommodation for the district is insufficient, publish a final notice stating the same particulars as were contained in the former notice, with such modifications (if any) as they think fit to make, and directing that the public school accommodation therein mentioned as required be supplied.

Formation of school board and requisition to provide schools.

"10. If after the expiration of a time, not exceeding six months, to be limited by the final notice, the Education Department are satisfied that all the public school accommodation required by the final notice to be supplied has not been so supplied, nor is in course of being supplied with due despatch, the Education Department shall cause a school board to be formed for the district as provided in this Act, and shall send a requisition to the school board so formed requiring them to take proceedings forthwith for supplying the public school accommodation mentioned in the requisition, and the school board shall supply the same accordingly.

Proceedings on default of school board.

"11. If the school board fail to comply with the requisition within twelve months after the sending of such requisition in manner aforesaid, they shall be deemed to be in default, and if the Education Department are satisfied that such board are in default they may proceed in manner directed by this Act with respect to a school board in default.

Formation of school boards without inquiry upon application.

"12. In the following cases (that is to say),

"(1.) Where application is made to the Education Department with respect to any school district by the persons who, if there were a school board in that district, would elect the school board, or with respect to any borough, by the council;

"(2.) Where the Education Department are satisfied that the managers of any elementary school in any school district are unable or unwilling any longer to maintain such school, and that if the school is discontinued the amount of public school accommodation for such district will be insufficient,

the Education Department may, if they think fit, without making the inquiry or publishing the notices required by this Act before the formation of a school board, but after such inquiry public or other, and such notice as the Education Department think sufficient, cause a school board to be formed for such district, and send a requisition to such school board in the same manner in all respects as if they had published a final notice.

"An application for the purposes of this section may be made by a resolution passed by the said electing body after notice published at least a week previously, or by the Council, and the provisions of the second part of the second schedule to this Act with respect to the passing of such resolution shall be observed.

Proceedings by Education Department after the first year.

"13. After the receipt of any returns under this Act subsequently to the first with respect to any school district, and after such inquiry as the Education Department think necessary, the Education Department shall consider whether any and what public school accommodation is required in such district in the same manner as in the case of the first returns under this Act, and where in such district there is no school board acting under this Act they may issue notices and take proceedings in the same manner as they may after the receipt of the first returns under this Act, and where there is a school board in such district they shall proceed in manner directed by this Act.

"*Management and Maintenance of Schools by School Board.*

Management of school by school board.

"14. Every school provided by a school board shall be conducted under the control and management of such board in accordance with the following regulations:

"(1.) The school shall be a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act:

"(2.) No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school.

Appointment of managers by school board.

"15. The school board may, if they think fit, from time to time delegate any of their powers under this Act except the power of raising money, and in particular may delegate the control and management of any school provided by them, with or without any conditions or restrictions, to a body of managers appointed by them, consisting of not less than three persons.

"The school board may from time to time remove all or any of such managers and within the limits allowed by this section add to or diminish the number of or otherwise alter

the constitution or powers of any body of managers formed by it under this section.

"Any manager appointed under this section may resign on giving written notice to the board. The rules contained in the third schedule to this Act respecting the proceedings of bodies of managers appointed by a school board shall be observed.

Neglect by board of regulations of public elementary schools.

"16. If the school board do or permit any act in contravention of or fail to comply with the regulations according to which a school provided by them is required by this Act to be conducted, the Education Department may declare the school board to be and such board shall accordingly be deemed to be a board in default, and the Education Department may proceed accordingly, and every act or omission of any member of the school board, or manager appointed by them, or any person under the control of the board, shall be deemed to be permitted by the board, unless the contrary be proved.

"If any dispute arises as to whether the school board have done or permitted any act in contravention of or have failed to comply with the said regulations, the matter shall be referred to the Education Department, whose decision thereon shall be final.

Fees of children.

"17. Every child attending a school provided by any school board shall pay such weekly fee as may be prescribed by the school board, with the consent of the Education Department, but the school board may from time to time, for a renewable period not exceeding six months, remit the whole or any part of such fee in the case of any child when they are of opinion that the parent of such child is unable from poverty to pay the same, but such remission shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent.

Maintenance by school board of schools and sufficient school accommodation.

"18. The school board shall maintain and keep efficient every school provided by such board, and shall from time to time provide such additional school accommodation as is, in their opinion, necessary in order to supply a sufficient amount of public school accommodation for their district.

"A school board may discontinue any school provided by them, or change the site of any such school, if they satisfy the Education Department that the school to be discontinued is unnecessary, or that such change of site is expedient.

"If at any time the Education Department are satisfied that a school board have failed to perform their duty, either by not maintaining or keeping efficient every school provided by them, or by not providing such additional school accommodation as in the opinion of the Education Department is necessary in order to supply a sufficient amount of public school accommodation in their district, the Education Department may send them a requisition requiring them to fulfil the duty which they have so failed

to perform; and if the school board fail within the time limited by such requisition, not being less than three months, to comply therewith to the satisfaction of the Education Department, such board shall be deemed to be a school board in default, and the Education Department may proceed accordingly.

Powers of school board for providing schools.

"19. Every school board for the purpose of providing sufficient public school accommodation for their district, whether in obedience to any requisition or not, may provide, by building or otherwise, schoolhouses properly fitted up, and improve, enlarge, and fit up any schoolhouse provided by them, and supply school apparatus and everything necessary for the efficiency of the schools provided by them, and purchase and take on lease any land, and any right over land, or may exercise any of such powers."

Then follow provisions relating to the compulsory purchase of sites, the purchase of land, and the sale or lease of land or schoolhouse belonging to a school board.

Next follow regulations in regard to the transfer of schools, as follows:—

Managers may transfer school to school board.

"23. The managers of any elementary school in the district of a school board may, in manner provided by this Act, make an arrangement with the school board for transferring their school to such school board, and the school board may assent to such arrangement.

"An arrangement under this section may be made by the managers by a resolution or other act as follows; (that is to say,)

"(1.) Where there is any instrument declaring the trusts of the school, and such instrument provides any manner in which or any assent with which a resolution or act binding the managers is to be passed or done, then in accordance with the provisions of such instrument:

"(2.) Where there is no such instrument, or such instrument contains no such provisions, then in the manner and with the assent, if any, in and with which it may be shown to the Education Department to have been usual for a resolution or act binding such managers to be passed or done:

"(3.) If no manner or assent can be shown to have been usual, then by a resolution passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of those members of their body who are present at a meeting of the body summoned for the purpose, and vote on the question, and with the assent of any other person whose assent under the circumstances appears to the Education Department to be requisite.

"And in every case such arrangement shall be made only—

"(1.) With the consent of the Education Department; and,

"(2.) If there are annual subscribers to such school, with

the consent of a majority, not being less than two-thirds in number, of those of the annual subscribers who are present at a meeting duly summoned for the purpose, and vote on the question.

"Provided that where there is any instrument declaring the trusts of the school, and such instrument contains any provision for the alienation of the school by any persons or in any manner or subject to any consent, any arrangement under this section shall be made by the persons in the manner and with the consent so provided.

"Where it appears to the Education Department that there is any trustee of the school who is not a manager, they shall cause the managers to serve on such trustee, if his name and address are known, such notice as the Education Department think sufficient; and the Education Department shall consider and have due regard to any objections and representations he may make respecting the proposed transfer.

"The Education Department shall consider and have due regard to any objections and representations respecting the proposed transfer which may be made by any person who has contributed to the establishment of such school.

"After the expiration of six months from the date of transfer the consent of the Education Department shall be conclusive evidence that the arrangement has been made in conformity with this section.

"An arrangement under this section may provide for the absolute conveyance to the school board of all the interest in the schoolhouse possessed by the managers or by any person who is trustee for them or for the school, or for the lease of the same, with or without any restrictions, and either at a nominal rent or otherwise, to the school board, or for the use by the school board of the schoolhouse during part of the week, and for the use of the same by the managers or some other person during the remainder of the week, or for any arrangement that may be agreed on. The arrangement may also provide for the transfer or application of any endowment belonging to the school or for the school board undertaking to discharge any debt charged on the school not exceeding the value of the interest in the schoolhouse or endowment transferred to them.

"When an arrangement is made under this section the managers may, whether the legal interest in the schoolhouse or endowment is vested in them or in some person as trustee for them or the school, convey to the school board all such interest in the schoolhouse and endowment as is vested in them or in such trustee, or such smaller interest as may be required under the arrangement.

"Nothing in this section shall authorise the managers to transfer any property which is not vested in them, or a trustee for them, or held in trust for the school; and where

any person has any right given him by the trusts of the school to use the school for any particular purpose independently of such managers, nothing in this section shall authorise any interference with such right except with the consent of such person.

"Every school so transferred shall, to such extent and during such times as the school board have under such arrangement any control over the school, be deemed to be a school provided by the school board.

Re-transfer of school by school board to managers.

"24. Where any school or any interest therein has been transferred by the managers thereof to the school board of any school district in pursuance of this Act, the school board of such district may, by a resolution passed as hereinafter mentioned, and with the consent of the Education Department, re-transfer such school or such interest therein to a body of managers qualified to hold the same under the trusts of the school as they existed before such transfer to the school board, and upon such re-transfer may convey all the interest in the schoolhouse and in any endowment belonging to the school vested in the school board.

"A resolution for the purpose of this section may be passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of those members of the school board who are present at a meeting duly convened for the purpose and vote on the question.

"The Education Department shall not give their consent to any such re-transfer unless they are satisfied that any money expended upon such school out of a loan raised by the school board of such district has been or will on the completion of the re-transfer be repaid to the school board.

"Every school so re-transferred shall cease to be a school provided by a school board, and shall be held upon the same trusts on which it was held before it was transferred to the school board."

After which the Act thus proceeds:—

"*Miscellaneous Powers of School Board.*

Payment of school fees.

"25. The school board may, if they think fit, from time to time, for a renewable period not exceeding six months, pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable at any public elementary school by any child resident in their district whose parent is in their opinion unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent; and such payment shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent.

Establishment of free school in special cases.

"26. If a school board satisfy the Education Department that, on the ground of the poverty of the inhabitants of any place in their district, it is expedient for the interests of education to provide a school at which no fees shall be

required from the scholars, the board may, subject to such rules and conditions as the Education Department may prescribe, provide such school and may admit scholars to such school without requiring any fee.

Contribution to industrial schools. 29 & 30 Vict. c. 118.

"27. A school board shall have the same powers of contributing money in the case of an industrial school as is given to a prison authority by section twelve of "The Industrial Schools Act, 1866;" and upon the election of a school board in a borough the council of that borough shall cease to have power to contribute under that section.

Establishment of industrial school.

"28. A school board may, with the consent of the Education Department, establish, build, and maintain a certified industrial school within the meaning of the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, and shall for that purpose have the same powers as they have for the purpose of providing sufficient school accommodation for their district: Provided that the school board, so far as regards any such industrial school, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State in the same manner as the managers of any other industrial school are subject, and such school shall be subject to the provisions of the said Act, and not of this Act.

"*Constitution of School Boards.*

School board.

"29. The school board shall be elected in manner provided by this Act,—in a borough by the persons whose names are on the burgess roll of such borough for the time being in force, and in a parish not situate in the metropolis by the ratepayers.

"At every such election every voter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of the members of the school board to be elected, and may give all such votes to one candidate, or may distribute them among the candidates, as he thinks fit.

"The school board in the metropolis shall be elected in manner hereinafter provided by this Act.

Constitution of school board.

"30. With respect to the constitution of a school board the following provisions shall have effect:

"(1.) The school board shall be a body corporate, by the name of the school board of the district to which they belong, having a perpetual succession and a common seal, with power to acquire and hold land for the purpose of this Act without any license in mortmain:

"(2.) No act or proceeding of the school board shall be questioned on account of any vacancy or vacancies in their body:

"(3.) No disqualification of or defect in the election of any persons or person acting as members or member of the school board shall be deemed to vitiate any proceedings of such board in which they or he have taken part, in cases where the majority of

members parties to such proceedings were duly entitled to act:

"(4.) Any minute made of proceedings at meetings of the school board, if signed by any person purporting to be the chairman of the board, either at the meeting of the board at which such proceedings took place or at the next ensuing meeting of the board, shall be receivable in evidence in all legal proceedings without further proof, and until the contrary is proved every meeting of the school board, in respect of the proceedings of which minutes have been so made, shall be deemed to have been duly convened and held, and all the members thereof to have been duly qualified to act:

"(5.) The members of a school board may apply any money in their hands for the purpose of indemnifying themselves against any law costs or damages which they may incur in or in consequence of the execution of the powers granted to them:

"(6.) The rules contained in the third schedule to this Act with respect to the proceedings of school boards, and the other matters therein contained, shall be observed.

Election of school board.

"31. With respect to the election under this Act of a school board, except in the metropolis, the following provisions shall have effect:

"(1.) The number of members of a school board shall be such number, not less than five nor more than fifteen, as may be determined in the first instance by the Education Department, and afterwards from time to time by a resolution of the school board approved by the Education Department;

"(2.) The regulations contained in the second schedule to this Act with respect to the election and retirement of the members of the school board, and the other matters therein contained, shall be of the same force as if they were enacted as part of this section;

"(3.) The Education Department may, at any time after the date at which they are authorised under this Act to cause a school board to be formed, send a requisition to the mayor or other officer or officers who have power to take proceedings for holding the election requiring him or them to take such proceedings, and the mayor or other officer or officers shall comply with such requisition; and in case of default some person appointed by the Education Department may take such proceedings, and shall have for that purpose the same powers as the person in default.

Non-election, &c. of school board.

"32. If from any cause in any school district the school board either are not elected at the time fixed for the first election, or at any time cease to be in existence, or to be of sufficient number to form a quorum by reason of non-election, or otherwise, or neglect or refuse to act, the Education Department may proceed in the same manner as if there were a school board acting in such district, and that the board were a board in default.

Determination of disputes as to the election of school boards.

"33. In case any question arises as to the right of any person to act as a member of a school board under this Act, the Education Department may, if they think fit, inquire into the circumstances of the case, and make such order as they deem just for determining the question, and such order shall be final unless removed by writ of certiorari during the term next after the making of such order.

Disqualification of member of board.

"34. No member of a school board, and no manager appointed by them, shall hold or accept any place of profit the appointment to which is vested in the school board or in any managers appointed by them, nor shall in any way share or be concerned in the profits of any bargain or contract with or any work done under the authority of such school board or managers appointed by them: Provided that this section shall not apply to—

"(1.) Any sale of land or loan of money to a school board; or,

"(2.) Any bargain or contract made with or work done by a company in which such member holds shares;

"(3.) The insertion of any advertisement relating to the affairs of any such school board in any newspaper in which such member has a share or interest,

if he does not vote with respect to such sale, loan, bargain, contract, work, or insertion.

Any person who acts in contravention of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, and the said place of profit and his office as member or manager shall be vacant.

Appointment of officers.

"35. A school board may appoint a clerk and a treasurer and other necessary officers, including the teachers required for any school provided by such board, to hold office during the pleasure of the board, and may assign them such salaries or remuneration (if any) as they think fit, and may from time to time remove any of such officers; but no such appointment shall be made, except at the first meeting of such board, unless notice in writing has been sent to every member of the board.

"Two or more school boards may arrange for the appointment of the same person to be an officer to both or all such boards.

"Such officers shall perform such duties as may be assigned to them by the board or boards who appoint them.

Officer to enforce

"36. Every school board may, if it think fit, appoint an officer or officers to enforce any byelaws under this Act

with reference to the attendance of children at school, and to bring children who are liable under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to be sent to a certified industrial school before two justices in order to their being so sent, and any expenses incurred under this section may be paid out of the school fund. attendance at school.

"*School Board in Metropolis.*

"37. The provisions of this Act with respect to the formation and the election of school boards in boroughs and parishes shall not extend to the metropolis; and with respect to a school board in the metropolis the following provisions shall have effect: School board in metropolis.

"(1.) The school board shall consist of such number of members elected by the divisions specified in the fifth schedule to this Act as the Education Department may by order fix:

"(2.) The Education Department, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, shall by order determine the boundaries of the said divisions for the purposes of this Act, and the number of members to be elected by each such division:

"(3.) The provisions of this Act with respect to the constitution of the school board shall extend to the constitution of the school board under this section, and the name of the school board shall be the School Board for London:

"(4.) The first election of the school board shall take place on such day, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, as the Education Department may appoint, and subsequent elections shall take place in the month of November every third year on the day from time to time appointed by the school board:

"(5.) At every election for each division every voter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of the members of the school board to be elected for such division, and may give all such votes to one candidate, or may distribute them among the candidates, as he thinks fit:

"(6.) Subject to the provisions contained in this section and in any order made by the Education Department under the power contained in the second schedule to this Act, the members of the board shall, in the city of London, be elected by the same persons and in like manner as common councilmen are elected, and in the other divisions of the metropolis shall be elected by the same persons and in the same manner as vestrymen under The Metropolis Management Act, 1855, and the Acts amending the same; and, subject as aforesaid, the Acts relating to the election of

common councilmen, and sections fourteen to nineteen, and twenty-one to twenty-seven, all inclusive, of The Metropolis Management Act, 1855, and section thirty-six of The Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862, shall, so far as is consistent with the tenor thereof, apply in the case of the election of members of the school board:

"(7.) The school board shall proceed at once to supply their district with sufficient public school accommodation, and any requisition sent by the Education Department to such board may relate to any of the divisions mentioned in the fifth schedule to this Act in like manner as if it were a school district, and it shall not be necessary for the Education Department to publish any notices before sending such requisition:

"(8.) The Education Department may, in the order fixing the boundaries of such divisions, name some person who shall be the returning officer for the purposes of the first election of the school board, and the person who is to be the deputy returning officer in each such division:

"(9.) The chairman of the school board shall be elected by the school board, and any chairman who may be elected by the board may be elected either from the members of the board or not, and any chairman who is not an elected member of the board shall by virtue of his office be a member of the board as if he had been so elected:

"(10.) The school board shall apportion the amount required to be raised to meet the deficiency in the school fund among the different parts of the metropolis mentioned in the third column of the first schedule to this Act in proportion to the rateable value of such parts as shown by the valuation lists for the time being in force under "The Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869," or, if any amount is so required before any such valuation list comes into force, in the same proportion and according to the same basis in and according to which the then last rate made by the Metropolitan Board of Works was assessed:

"(11.) For obtaining payment of the amount specified in any precept sent by the school board to the rating authority for any part of the metropolis, the school board, in addition to any other powers and remedies, shall have the like powers as the Metropolitan Board of Works have for obtaining payment of any sum assessed by them on the same part of the metropolis.

"38. The school board for London may pay to the chairman of such board such salary as they may from time to time, with the sanction of the Education Department, fix. Payment of chairman.

"39. If at any time application is made to the Education Department by the school board for London, or by any six members of that board, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the Education Department that the population of any of the divisions mentioned in the fifth schedule to this Act, as shown by any census taken under the authority of Parliament, has varied materially from that shown by the previous census, or that the rateable value of any of the said divisions has materially varied from the rateable value of the same division ten years previously, the Education Department, after such inquiry as they think necessary, may, if they think fit, make an order altering, by way of increase or decrease, the number of members of that and any other division. Alteration of number of members.

"*United School Districts.*

"40. Where the Education Department are of opinion that it would be expedient to form a school district larger than a borough or a parish or any school district formed under this Act, they may, except in the metropolis, by order made after such inquiry and notice as hereinafter mentioned, form a united school district by uniting any two or more adjoining school districts, and upon such union cause a school board to be formed for such united school district. Formation by Education Department of united districts.

"A united school district shall for all the purposes of this Act be deemed to be a school district, and shall throughout this Act be deemed to be substituted for the school districts out of which it is constituted, and the school board of the united school district shall be the school board appointed under this Act, and the local rate and rating authority for the united district shall be in each of the constituent districts thereof the same as if such constituent district did not form part of the united school district.

"41. The Education Department, as soon as may be after the passing of this Act, may cause inquiry to be made into the expediency of uniting any two or more school districts, and if after such inquiry they are of opinion that it would be expedient to unite any such school districts, they shall in the notice of their decision as to the public school accommodation for such districts state that they propose to unite such districts, and the provisions of this Act with respect to the application for a public inquiry by persons aggrieved by the said notice, and to the holding of such public inquiry, and to the final notice, shall apply in the case of the proposed union of districts with this qualification, that it shall not be necessary to cause a public inquiry to be held with respect to the union of districts until after the Conditions of formation of district.

expiration of the period allowed by the final notice for the supply of school accommodation. The order for the union may be made at the time when the Education Department are first authorised to cause a school board to be formed or subsequently. Where a union of districts is proposed the Education Department shall consider whether any public school accommodation is required for the area proposed as the united district instead of for each of the districts constituting such area, and their decision as to the public school accommodation and the notice of such decision shall accordingly refer to such area, and not separately to each of the constituent districts.

As to dissolution of united school district.

"42. The Education Department may, by order made after such inquiry and notice as hereinafter mentioned, dissolve a united school district, and may deal with the constituent districts thereof in the same manner as if they had never been united, and may cause school boards to be elected therein.

Public inquiry as to united district in future.

"43. The Education Department may at any time, after any proceedings after the first returns under this Act, if they think fit, cause inquiry to be made into the expediency of forming or dissolving a united school district, and where they propose at any time after such inquiry to form or dissolve a united school district, they shall publish notice of the proposed order not less than three months before the order is made; the like persons as are authorised to apply for a public inquiry after the first returns made under this Act may, if they feel aggrieved by the proposed order, apply in like manner for a public inquiry, and the Education Department shall cause a public inquiry to be held, and shall consider the report made to them upon such inquiry before they make the order for such formation or dissolution.

Order to be evidence of formation or dissolution.

"44. Any order of the Education Department forming or dissolving a united district shall be evidence of the formation or dissolution of such district, and after the expiration of three months from the date of such order the district shall be presumed to have been duly formed or dissolved, as the case may be, and no objection to the formation or dissolution thereof shall be entertained in any legal proceedings whatever.

Constitution of school in united school district.

"45. The provisions in this Act respecting the constitution of the school board shall apply to the constitution of the school board in a united school district, and the name of the district shall be such as may be prescribed by the Education Department.

Election of school board in united school district.

"46. In a united school district the school board shall be such number of members elected by the electors of the district as may be specified in the order forming the district, subject nevertheless to alteration in the same manner as in the case of any other school board; and every person who in any of the districts constituting such united district would

be entitled if it were not united to vote at the election of members of a school board for such constituent district shall be an elector for the purposes of this section, and the provisions of this Act respecting the election of a school board in a district shall extend to the election of such members.

Arrangements on formation of united district.

"47. Where any part of a proposed united school district includes any district or part of a district in which there is a school board already acting under this Act, or where a united school district is dissolved, the Education Department may by order dissolve the then existing school board, or make all necessary changes in the constitution of such existing school board, and may by order make proper arrangements respecting the schools, property, rights, and liabilities of such board, and all arrangements which may be necessary.

As to small parishes.

"48. If the Education Department are of opinion that any parish in a united school district has too few ratepayers to be entitled to act as a separate parish for the purposes of this Act, they may by order direct that it shall for the purpose of voting for a member or members of the school board, and for all or any of the purposes of this Act, be added to another parish, and thereupon the persons who would be entitled to vote and attend the vestry if it were a parish shall be entitled for the purpose of voting and for such purposes to vote in and attend the vestry of the parish to which their parish is so added. All the parishes comprised in a united district, or any two or more of them, may be added together in pursuance of this section.

"*Contributory Districts.*

Contributory district.

"49. The Education Department may by order direct that one school district shall contribute towards the provision or maintenance of public elementary schools in another school district or districts, and in such case the former (or contributing district) shall pay to the latter (or school owning district or districts) such proportion of the expenses of such provision or maintenance or a sum calculated in such manner as the Education Department may from time to time prescribe.

Election of members by contributory district.

"50. Where one school district contributes to the provision or maintenance of any school in another school district, such number of persons as the Education Department (having regard to the amount to be contributed by the contributing district) direct shall be elected in the contributing district, and shall be members of the school board of the school owning district, but such last-mentioned district shall, except so far as regards the raising of money and the attendance of children at school, be deemed alone to be the district of such school board; such members shall be elected by the school board, if any, or, if there is none, by the persons who would elect a school board if

there were one, in the same manner as a school board would be elected.

Notices and public inquiry as to contributory district.

"51. The provisions of this Act with respect to the notices to be published, and the application for and the holding of a public inquiry in the case of an order for the formation of a united district, shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to an order respecting a contributory district.

"An order respecting a contributory district shall be evidence of the formation of such district, and after the expiration of three months from the date thereof shall be presumed to have been duly made, and no objection to the legality thereof shall be entertained in any legal proceeding whatever.

"Any such order may be revoked or altered by an order of the Education Department, and a new order may be made in lieu thereof, and all the provisions of this Act respecting the making of an order for contribution shall apply to the making of an order for the revocation or alteration of an order for contribution.

Combination of school boards.

"52. The school boards of any two or more school districts, with the sanction of the Education Department, may combine together for any purpose relating to elementary schools in such districts, and in particular may combine for the purpose of providing, maintaining, and keeping efficient schools common to such districts. Such agreements may provide for the appointment of a joint body of managers under the provisions of this Act with respect to the appointment of a body of managers, and for the proportion of the contributions to be paid by each school district, and any other matters which, in the opinion of the Education Department, are necessary for carrying out such agreement, and the expenses of such joint body of managers shall be paid in the proportions specified in the agreement by each of the school boards out of their school fund.

"*Expenses.*

School fund of school board.

"53. The expenses of the school board under this Act shall be paid out of a fund called the school fund. There shall be carried to the school fund all moneys received as fees from scholars, or out of moneys provided by Parliament, or raised by way of loan, or in any manner whatever received by the school board, and any deficiency shall be raised by the school board as provided by this Act.

Deficiency of school fund raised out of rates.

"54. Any sum required to meet any deficiency in the school fund, whether for satisfying past or future liabilities, shall be paid by the rating authority out of the local rate.

"The school board may serve their precept on the rating authority, requiring such authority to pay the amount specified therein to the treasurer of the school board out of the local rate, and such rating authority shall pay the same accordingly, and the receipt of such treasurer shall be a

good discharge for the amount so paid, and the same shall be carried to the school fund.

"If the rating authority have no moneys in their hands in respect of the local rate, they shall, or if they have paid the amount then for the purpose of reimbursing themselves they may, notwithstanding any limit under any Act of Parliament or otherwise, levy the said rate, or any contributions thereto, or any increase of the said rate or contributions, and for that purpose shall have the same powers of levying a rate and requiring contributions as they have for the purpose of defraying expenses to which the local rate is ordinarily applicable.

Apportionment of school fund in united and contributory district.

"55. In a united district the school board shall apportion the amount required to meet the deficiency in the school fund among the districts constituting such united district in proportion to the rateable value of each such constituent district, and may raise the same by a precept sent to the rating authority of each constituent district.

"Where one school district contributes to the expenses of the schools in another school district, the authority of the school owning district may send their precept either to the school board, if any, or to the rating authority of the contributing district, requiring them to pay to their treasurer the amount therein specified, and such authority or board shall pay the same accordingly, and the receipt of the treasurer shall be a good discharge for the same, and such amount, if paid by the school board, shall be paid out of the school fund.

"The precept, if sent to the rating authority, either on the default of the school board or otherwise, shall be deemed to be a precept for meeting a deficiency in the school fund, and the provisions of this Act shall apply accordingly."

Clauses 56 to 58 relate to the remedy of the school board on default of rating authority, &c.; and to the borrowing of money by school boards.

Next follow special provisions in regard to "Accounts and Audit."

The following are the provisions respecting a defaulting school board:—

Proceedings on default by school board.

"63. Where the Education Department are, after such inquiry as they think sufficient, satisfied that a school board is in default as mentioned in this Act, they may by order declare such board to be in default, and by the same or any other order appoint any persons, not less than five or more than fifteen, to be members of such school board, and may from time to time remove any member so appointed, and fill up any vacancy in the number of such members, whether caused by removal, resignation, death, or otherwise, and, subject as aforesaid, add to or diminish the number of such members.

"After the date of the order of appointment the persons (if any) who were previously members of the school board shall be deemed to have vacated their offices as if they were dead, but any such member may be appointed a member by the Education Department. The members so appointed by the Education Department shall be deemed to be members of the school board in the same manner in all respects as if, by election or otherwise, they had duly become members of the school board under the other provisions of this Act, and may perform all the duties and exercise all the powers of the school board under this Act.

"The members appointed by the Education Department shall hold office during the pleasure of the Education Department, and when that department consider that the said default has been remedied, and everything necessary for that purpose has been carried into effect, they may, by order, direct that members be elected for the school board in the same manner as in the case of the first formation of the school board. After the date fixed by any such order the members appointed by the Education Department shall cease to be members of the school board, and the members so elected shall be members of the school board in their room, but the members appointed by the Education Department shall not be disqualified from being so elected. Until any such order is made no person shall become a member of the school board otherwise than by the appointment of the Education Department.

"Where a school board is not elected at the time fixed for the first election, or has ceased to be in existence, the Education Department may proceed in the same manner as if such board had been elected and were in existence.

Certificate of Education Department as to appointment, expenses, and loans.

"64. The Education Department may from time to time certify the appointment of any persons appointed to be members of a school board in default, and the amount of expenses that have been incurred by such persons, and the amount of any loan required to be raised for the purpose of defraying any expenses so incurred, or estimated as about to be incurred; and such certificate shall be conclusive evidence that all the requirements of this Act have been duly complied with, and that the persons so appointed have been duly appointed, and that the amounts therein mentioned have been incurred or are required.

Expenses incurred on default.

"65. The expenses incurred in the performance of their duties by the persons appointed by the Education Department to be members of a school board, including such remuneration (if any) as the Education Department may assign to such persons, shall, together with all expenses incurred by the board, be paid out of the school fund; and any deficiency in the school fund may be raised by the school board as provided by this Act; and where the Education Department have, either before or after the payment of such expenses, certified that any expenses have been

incurred by a school board, or any members appointed by them, such expenses shall be deemed to have been so incurred, and to have been properly paid out of the school fund.

"Where the members of a school board have been appointed by the Education Department, such school board shall not borrow or charge the school fund with the principal and interest of any loan exceeding such amount as the Education Department certify as mentioned in this Act to be required.

Dissolution of school boards.

"66. Where the Education Department are of opinion that in the case of any school district the school board for such district are in default, or are not properly performing their duties under this Act, they may by order direct that the then members of the school board of such district shall vacate their seats, and that the vacancies shall be filled by a new election; and after the date fixed by any such order the then members of such board shall be deemed to have vacated their seats, and a new election shall be held in the same manner, and the Education Department shall take the same proceedings for the purpose of such election as if it were the first election; and all the provisions of this Act relating to such first election shall apply accordingly.

"The Education Department shall cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament in every year a special report stating the cases in which they have made any order under this section during the preceding year, and their reasons for making such order."

After sections relating to "Returns and Inquiry," and "Public Inquiry," we come to the permissive compulsory clauses, as follows:—

"*Attendance at School.*

As to attendance of children at school.

"74. Every school board may from time to time, with the approval of the Education Department, make bye-laws for all or any of the following purposes:—

"(1.) Requiring the parents of children of such age, not less than five years nor more than thirteen years, as may be fixed by the bye-laws, to cause such children (unless there is some reasonable excuse) to attend school:

"(2.) Determining the time during which children are so to attend school; provided that no such bye-law shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects, or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs, or shall be contrary to anything contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour:

"(3.) Providing for the remission or payment of the whole or any part of the fees of any child where the parent satisfies the school board that he is unable from poverty to pay the same:

"(4.) Imposing penalties for the breach of any bye-laws:

"(5.) Revoking or altering any bye-law previously made.

"Provided that any bye-law under this section requiring a child between ten and thirteen years of age to attend school shall provide for the total or partial exemption of such child from the obligation to attend school if one of Her Majesty's inspectors certifies that such child has reached a standard of education specified in such bye-law.

Any of the following reasons shall be a reasonable excuse; namely,

"(1.) That the child is under efficient instruction in some other manner:

"(2.) That the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness or any unavoidable cause:

"(3.) That there is no public elementary school open which the child can attend within such distance, not exceeding three miles, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child, as the bye-laws may prescribe.

"The school board, not less than one month before submitting any bye-law under this section for the approval of the Education Department, shall deposit a printed copy of the proposed bye-laws at their office for inspection by any ratepayer, and supply a printed copy thereof gratis to any ratepayer, and shall publish a notice of such deposit.

"The Education Department before approving of any bye-laws shall be satisfied that such deposit has been made and notice published, and shall cause such inquiry to be made in the school district as they think requisite.

"Any proceeding to enforce any bye-law may be taken, and any penalty for the breach of any bye-law may be recovered, in a summary manner; but no penalty imposed for the breach of any bye-law shall exceed such amount as with the costs will amount to five shillings for each offence, and such bye-laws shall not come into operation until they have been sanctioned by Her Majesty in Council.

"It shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Order in Council, to sanction the said bye-laws, and thereupon the same shall have effect as if they were enacted in this Act.

"All bye-laws sanctioned by Her Majesty in Council under this section shall be set out in an appendix to the annual report of the Education Department."

After this come a large number of Miscellaneous Regulations (Clauses 75-95). And then the section relating, as follows, to the

"PARLIAMENTARY GRANT.

"96. After the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one no parliamentary grant shall be made to any elementary school which is not a public elementary school within the meaning of this Act. Parliamentary grant to public elementary school only.

"No parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up any elementary school, except in pursuance of a memorial duly signed, and containing the information required by the Education Department for enabling them to decide on the application, and sent to the Education Department on or before the thirty-first day of December one thousand eight hundred and seventy.

"97. The conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain an annual parliamentary grant shall be those contained in the minutes of the Education Department in force for the time being, and shall amongst other matters provide that the thirty-first day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-one— Conditions of annual parliamentary grant.

"(1.) Such grants shall not be made in respect of any instruction in religious subjects:

"(2.) Such grant shall not for any year exceed the income of the school for that year which was derived from voluntary contributions, and from school fees, and from any sources other than the parliamentary grant;

but such conditions shall not require that the school shall be in connection with a religious denomination, or that religious instruction shall be given in the school, and shall not give any preference or advantage to any school on the ground that it is or is not provided by a school board:

"Provided that where the school board satisfy the Education Department that in any year ending the twenty-ninth of September the sum required for the purpose of the annual expenses of the school board of any school district, and actually paid to the treasurer of such board by the rating authority, amounted to a sum which would have been raised by a rate of threepence in the pound on the rateable value of such district, and any such rate would have produced less than twenty pounds, or less than seven shillings and sixpence per child of the number of children in the average attendance at the public elementary schools provided by such school board, such school board shall be entitled, in addition to the annual parliamentary grant in aid of the public elementary schools provided by them, to such further sum out of moneys provided by Parliament as, when added to the sum actually so paid by the rating authority, would, as the case may be, make up the sum of twenty pounds, or the sum of seven shillings and sixpence for each such child, but no attendance shall be reckoned for the purpose of calculating such average

attendance unless it is an attendance as defined in the said minutes:

"Provided that no such minute of the Education Department not in force at the time of the passing of this Act shall be deemed to be in force until it has lain for not less than one month on the table of both Houses of Parliament.

Refusal of grant to unnecessary schools.

"98. If the managers of any school which is situate in the district of a school board acting under this Act, and is not previously in receipt of an annual parliamentary grant, whether such managers are a school board or not, apply to the Education Department for a parliamentary grant, the Education Department may, if they think that such school is unnecessary, refuse such application.

"The Education Department shall cause to be laid before both Houses of Parliament in every year a special report stating the cases in which they have refused a grant under this section during the preceding year, and their reasons for each such refusal.

Power of schools to take parliamentary grants.

"99. The managers of every elementary school shall have power to fulfil the conditions required in pursuance of this Act to be fulfilled in order to obtain a parliamentary grant, notwithstanding any provision contained in any instrument regulating the trusts or management of their school, and to apply such grant accordingly."

The hundredth clause, providing for an annual report of the Education Department to Parliament, closes the Act, after which follow the schedules, relating to local rating funds and authorities, to the election and retirement of school board members, rules for applications for a school board, rules for the election of the London School Board, as to the proceedings of school boards, &c.

APPENDIX (B).

The following are the most important articles in the Code now in force in all public elementary schools, according to the latest revision (1873).—Definitions—

4. An elementary school is a school, or department of a school, at which elementary education is the principal part of the education there given, and does not include any school or department of a school at which the ordinary payments, in respect of the instruction, from each scholar, exceed ninepence a week (Elementary Education Act, 1870, sec. 3).

5. Aid to maintain schools is given by annual grants to the managers conditional upon the attendance and proficiency of the scholars, the qualifications of the teachers, and the state of the schools.

6. No grants are made to elementary schools which are not public elementary schools within the meaning of the Elementary Education Act, 1870.

7. No grant is made in respect of any instruction in religious subjects.

8. Officers are employed to verify the fulfilment of the conditions on which grants are made, to collect information, and to report the results to the Education Department.

9. These officers are inspectors appointed by Her Majesty, on the recommendation of the Education Department, and persons appointed by the Department, as occasion requires, in the capacity of acting inspectors, or inspectors' assistants.

10. No grant is paid except on a report from an inspector, showing that the conditions of the grant have been fulfilled.

. . . . . .

Preliminary Conditions.

17. Before any grant is made to a school (Article 4) the Education Department must be satisfied that—

(*a.*) The school is conducted as a public elementary school (Article 6); and no child is refused admission to the school on other than reasonable grounds.

(*b.*) The school is not carried on with a view to private emolument.

(*c.*) The school premises are healthy, well lighted, warmed, drained, and ventilated, properly furnished, supplied with suitable offices, and contain in the principal schoolroom at least 80 cubical feet of internal space, and in the schoolroom and class-rooms at least 8 square feet of area, for each child in average attendance.

(*d.*) The principal teacher is certificated (Article 43).

Exception :—

Evening schools may be taught by pupil-teachers who have completed their engagement with credit (Article 79).

(*e.*) Notice is immediately given to the Department of the date at which the teacher enters on the charge of the school, from which date the grant is computed.

(*f.*) The girls in the school are taught plain needlework and cutting out as parts of the ordinary course of instruction.

(*g.*) The infants, if any, attending the school are instructed suitably to their age, and in a manner not to interfere with the instruction of the older children.

(*h.*) Registers of admission and daily attendance, and accounts of income and expenditure, are accurately kept and duly audited; and all statistical returns and certificates of character (Articles 67, 77, and 80) may be accepted as trustworthy.

(*i.*) Three persons have designated one of their number to sign the receipt for the grant on behalf of the school.

Exception :—

The treasurer of a school board signs the receipt for grants to schools provided by the board.

18. The grant may be withheld, if, on the inspector's report, there appears to be any serious *primâ facie* objection. A second inspection, wherein another inspector takes part, is made in every such instance, and if the grant be finally withheld, a special minute of the case is made and recorded.

Grants to Day Schools.

19. The managers of a school which has met not less than 400 times, in the morning and afternoon, in the course of a year, as defined by Article 13, may claim at the end of such year—

A. The sum of 6*s.* per scholar, according to the average number in attendance throughout the year (Article 26).

B. For every scholar, present on the day of examination, who has attended not less than 250 morning or afternoon meetings of the school:—

1. If above four, and under seven, years of age at the end of the year (Article 13),—
   (*a.*) 8*s.*, or
   (*b.*) 10*s.* if the infants are taught as a separate department, by a certificated teacher of their own, in a room properly constructed and furnished for their instruction.
2. If more than seven years of age, 12*s.*, subject to examination (Article 28), viz.—
   4*s.* for passing in reading;
   4*s.* for passing in writing;
   4*s.* for passing in arithmetic.

20. 150 attendances (Article 23) qualify for examination—
   (*a.*) Scholars attending school under any half-time Act.
   (*b.*) Boys above 10 attending school in a rural district.

21. If the time-table of the school, in use throughout the year, has provided for one or more specific subjects of secular instruction beyond Article 28,—

A grant of 3*s.* per subject may be made for every day scholar, presented in Standards IV.—VI. (Article 28) who passes a satisfactory examination in not more than two of such subjects (Schedule IV.).

No grant may be claimed under this Article on account of any scholar who has been examined, in the same subject, within the preceding year, by the Department of Science and Art.

Grants to Evening Schools (*Articles* 106—112).

22. The managers of a school which has met not less than 60 times in the evening, in the course of a year, as defined by Article 107, may claim (Articles 108 and 109),—

(*a.*) The sum of 4*s.* per scholar, according to the average number in attendance throughout the year (Article 26).

(*b.*) For every scholar who has attended not less than 40 evening meetings of the school 7*s.* 6*d.*, subject to examination (Article 28), viz., 2*s.* 6*d.* for passing in reading, 2*s.* 6*d.* for passing in writing, and 2*s.* 6*d.* for passing in arithmetic.

Calculation of Attendance.

23. Attendance at a morning or afternoon meeting may not be reckoned for any scholar who has been under instruction in secular subjects less than two hours, nor attendance at an evening meeting for any scholar who has been under similar instruction less than one hour and a half.

24. Attendance of boys at drill, under a competent instructor, for not more than two hours a week, and 40 hours in the year, may, in a day school be counted as school attendance.

25. Attendances may not be reckoned for any scholar above 18, or in a day school under 3, or, in an evening school, under 12 years of age.

26. The average number of scholars in attendance for any period is found by adding together the attendances of all the scholars for the same period, and dividing the sum by the number of times the school has met within the same period; the quotient is the average number in attendance.

27. In calculating the average number in attendance, the attendances of half-time scholars reckon for no more than those of other scholars.

Standards of Examination.

28.	Standard I.	Standard II.	Standard III.	Standard IV.	Standard V.	Standard VI.
Reading.	A short paragraph from a book used in the school, not confined to words of one syllable.	A short paragraph from an elementary reading book.	A short paragraph from a more advanced reading book.	A few lines of poetry selected by the inspector.	A short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper, or other modern narrative.	To read with fluency and expression.
Writing.	Copy in manuscript character a line of print, and write from dictation a few common words.	A sentence from the same book, slowly read once, and then dictated in single words.	A sentence slowly dictated once by a few words at a time, from the same book.	A sentence slowly dictated once, by a few words at a time, from a reading book.	A short paragraph in a newspaper, or 10 lines of verse, slowly dictated once by a few words at a time.	A short theme or letter, or an easy paraphrase.
Arithmetic.	Simple addition and subtraction of numbers of not more than four figures, and the multiplication table, to 6 times 12.	Subtraction, multiplication, and short division.	Long division and compound rules (money).	Compound rules (common weights and measures).	Practice and bills of parcels.	Proportion and fractions (vulgar and decimal).

29. No scholar may be presented a second time for examination—
(*a.*) under a lower Standard; *or*,
(*b.*) under the same Standard.

30. *After the* 31*st of December*, 1874, no day scholar above 9 years of age, and no evening scholar above 13, will be examined in Standard I.

31. *After the* 31*st of December*, 1875, no day scholar above 9 years of age, and no evening scholar above 14, will be examined in Standard II.

Reduction of Grants.

32. The amount which may be claimed by the managers under Articles 19-22 is reduced,—

(*a.*) By its excess above,—
1. The income of the school from fees, rates, and subscriptions;
2. The rate of 15*s.* per scholar according to the average number in attendance; and
3. One half the expenditure on the annual maintenance of the school,

} in the year defined by Article 13.

(*b.*) By not less than one-tenth nor more than one-half in the whole upon the inspector's report, for faults of instruction, discipline, or registration, on the part of the teacher, or (after six months' notice) for failure on the part of the managers to remedy any such defect in the premises as seriously interferes with the efficiency of the school, or to provide proper furniture, books, maps, and other apparatus of elementary instruction. If the inspector at a visit of surprise (Article 12), not less than six months after notice has been given of the requirements of the Education Department, reports that they have have not been carried into effect, a deduction may be made from the next grant to the school.

(*c.*) At the rate of 20*l.* for the year, for every 40 scholars, after the first 20, of the average number in attendance, unless there has been during the year one pupil-teacher fulfilling the conditions of Article 70 for every such 40 scholars. A certificated (Article 43) assistant teacher, or an assistant fulfilling the conditions of Article 79, is equivalent to two pupil-teachers.

The forfeiture may be reduced from 20*l.* to 10*l.* if a pupil-teacher fails in examination, but produces the prescribed certificates (Article 77). This reduction of the forfeiture is made only once for the same pupil-teacher, and not in successive years for the same school.

(*d.*) By one shilling per scholar, according to the average number in attendance throughout the year, unless vocal music forms a part of the ordinary course of instruction.

(*e.*) The payments under Article 19 B. 1 (*a.*) may be withheld if the inspector reports that the scholars under 7 years of age are not satisfactorily taught.

(*f.*) No payment will be made under Article 21 if less than 75 per cent. of the passes attainable in the Standard Examination (Article 28) has been obtained.

33. If the excess of scholars has arisen from increased attendance of children since the last settlement of the school staff (Article 39), the amount claimed by the managers is not reduced under Article 32*c*.

. . . . . .

TEACHERS REFERRED TO IN THE PRECEDING SECTION.

41. The recognised classes of teachers are,—(*a.*) Certificated teachers. (*b.*) Pupil-teachers. (*c.*) Assistant teachers.

42. Lay persons alone can be recognised as teachers in elementary schools.

Certificated Teachers.

43. Teachers in order to obtain certificates, must be examined (Article 44), and must undergo probation by actual service in school (Article 51).

Examination.

44. Examinations are held in December of each year at the several training schools under inspection (Article 100).

45. A syllabus of the subjects of examination for male and female candidates respectively may be had on application to the Education Department.

46. The names of teachers desiring to be examined must be notified by the managers of their schools to the Education Department before the 1st day of October preceding the examination.

47. Candidates admissible to be examined for certificates must be,—

(*a.*) Students who have resided for one year in training schools under inspection; *or*,

(*b.*) Teachers of elementary schools (Article 4), to which annual grants are or may be made, who are upwards of 21 years of age, and have either—

1. completed an engagement as pupil-teacher satisfactorily;
2. obtained a favourable report from an inspector; *or*,
3. served as assistants, for at least six months, in schools under certificated teachers.

48. Teachers attending the examination may at their option take the papers of the first or second year's students (Article 102).

49. A list is published showing the successful candidates of each year, whether students or acting teachers, arranged in four divisions.

50. The relative proficiency of the candidates according to examination is recorded upon their certificates.

Probation.

51. Candidates for certificates, after successfully passing their examination, must, as teachers continuously engaged in the same schools, obtain two favourable reports from an inspector, with an interval of one year (Article 13) between them; and if the first of these reports be not preceded by service of three months (at the least) since the examination, a third report, at an interval of one year after the second report, is required. If the second (or third) report is favourable a certificate is issued.

52. Teachers under probation satisfy the conditions which require that schools be kept by certificated teachers.

Certificates.

53. Certificates are of three classes. No certificate is originally issued above the second class. The third (lowest) class includes special certificates for teachers of infants, and of small schools.

Certificates of the First and Second Class.

54. Candidates who are placed by examination in any of the first three divisions (Article 49), receive certificates of the second class, which can be raised to the first class by good service only.

55. Certificates of the second class remain in force for 10 years from the date of their issue, after which interval they are open to revision according to the intermediate reports.

Certificates of the Third Class.

56. Candidates who are placed by examination in the fourth division (Article 49) receive certificates of the third class.

57. Certificates of the third class do not entitle the teachers to have the charge of pupil-teachers.

58. Certificates of the third class can be raised by examination only.

59. *During the three years ending* 31*st December*, 1873, certificates of the third class may be granted, without examination, upon the report of an inspector, to acting teachers who satisfy the following conditions:—

(1.) They must, at the date of the inspector's report,—
  (*a.*) be above 35 years of age;
  (*b.*) have been teachers of elementary schools for at least 10 years; and
  (*c.*) present certificates of good character from the managers of their schools.

(2.) The inspector must report,—
  (*a.*) that they are efficient teachers;
  (*b.*) that not less than 30 children, who had been under instruction in their schools during the preceding six months, were individually examined (Article 28); and
  (*c.*) that at least 20 of the "passes" of these scholars in reading, writing, or arithmetic, were made in the second or some higher standard.

59 (*a.*). In schools attended by infants only (under 7 years of age) 30 years will be accepted as the limit of age for the teacher, under Article 59 (1), (*a*), and the conditions of Article 59 (2), (*b.* and *c*) are not required to be fulfilled.

60. Pupil-teachers who have completed their engagement with credit, and who have passed satisfactorily either the examination for the close of their fifth year (Schedule I.) or (Article 94) that referred to in Article 91, may, upon special recommendation by the inspector, be provisionally certificated in the third class for immediate service in charge of schools (Article 4) which have an annual average attendance of less than 60 scholars.

61. After their 25th year of age (completed) their provisional cer-

tificates must have been exchanged for permanent certificates (Article 43) or are *ipso facto* cancelled.

62. The provisional certificate is confined to an entry of the pupil-teacher's name in a register kept by the Education Department, and does not involve the issue of any certificate to the pupil-teacher.

Future Rating of existing Certificates.

63. Existing certificates of the first or second class are rated as of the first class.

64. Existing certificates of the third class, or upper grade of the fourth class, and infant school certificates of the first class, are rated as of the second class. Such certificates will be open to revision at the end of 10 years from the date of their issue, or of their last revision.

65. Existing certificates of the lower grade of the fourth class and infant school certificates of the second class are rated as of the third class.

66. The class of any certificate not yet issued will be fixed by Articles 54 and 56.

Reports of Managers and Inspector.

67. The managers must annually state whether the teacher's character, conduct, and attention to duty have been satisfactory.

68. The inspector reports of each school visited by him whether it is efficient in organization, discipline, and instruction.

69. Certificates may, at any time, be recalled, suspended, or reduced under Articles 67 and 68.

Pupil-teachers.

70. Pupil-teachers are boys or girls employed to serve in a school on the following conditions, namely :—

(*a*). *That the school* is reported by the inspector to be—

1. Under a duly certificated teacher (Articles 43 and 57).
2. Held in suitable premises.
3. Well furnished and well supplied with books and apparatus.
4. Properly organized and skilfully instructed.
5. Under good discipline.
6. Likely to be maintained during the period of engagement.

(*b*.) *That the pupil-teachers* be not less than 13 years (completed) of age at the date of their engagement.

(*c*.) Be of the same sex as the certificated teacher under whom they serve; but in a mixed school female pupil-teachers may serve under a master, and may receive instruction from him out of school hours, on condition that some respectable woman, approved by the managers, be invariably present during the whole time that such instruction is being given.

(*d*.) Be presented to the inspector for examination at the time and place fixed by his notice (Article 11).

(*e*.) Pass the examinations and produce the certificates specified in Schedule I.

(*f*.) *That the managers* enter into an agreement in the terms of the memorandum in the Second Schedule to this Code, a copy of

which memorandum is sent to the managers for every candidate approved by the Department.

(*g*.) That not more than *four* pupil-teachers are engaged in the school for every certificated teacher serving in it. (*This Article will take effect from the* 1*st of April* 1874.)

71. The Education Department is not a party to the engagement, and confines itself to ascertaining, on the admission of the pupil-teacher and at the end of each year of the service—

(*a*.) Whether the prescribed examination is passed before the inspector.

(*b*.) Whether the prescribed certificates are produced from the managers and teachers.

. . . . . .

73. Vacancies in the office of pupil-teacher which occur in the course of any year (Article 13) must not be filled up until after the next examination by the inspector.

74. The candidate or candidates for such vacancies must be engaged in the meantime by the week only as monitors, and the memorandum of agreement (Article 70*f*) will not be issued by the Education Department to the managers until the inspector's report has been examined.

75. Temporary monitors engaged by the week, pursuant to Article 74, for the supply of vacant pupil-teacherships during a current year (Article 13), satisfy Article 32 (*c*), provided—

(*a*.) That a sufficient number of candidates to complete the requisite proportion of teachers to scholars pass the next examination for admission (Article 77) to permanent engagements; and

(*b*.) That the vacancies are reported to the Education Department as soon as they occur, and have been occasioned by causes which are accepted by the Education Department as satisfactory.

76. Except in the cases provided for by Article 75, each vacancy in a pupil-teachership during a current year (Article 13) works a forfeiture under Article 32 (*c*).

77. The qualifications and certificates required of candidates for admission, and of pupil-teachers in each year of their service, are regulated by the First Schedule annexed to this Code.

Pupil-teachers who have successfully completed their Engagement.

78. At the close of their engagement pupil-teachers are perfectly free in the choice of employment. If they wish to continue in the work of education, they may become assistants in elementary schools (Article 79), or may be examined for admission into a training school (Article 91), or may be provisionally certificated for immediate service in charge of small schools (Article 60).

Assistant Teachers.

79. Pupil-teachers who have completed their engagement with credit, (having passed satisfactorily either of the examinations referred to in Article 60) and candidates, not having been pupil-teachers (Article 93 *c*), who have passed with success (Article 94) the examination referred to in Article 91, may serve as assistants in schools

in place of pupil-teachers, without being required to be annually examined.

80. Such assistants cease to fulfil the conditions of Article 32 (*c*), if at any time the inspector reports them to be inefficient teachers, or if they fail to produce from the managers, and from the principal teacher, of their school, the same certificates of conduct, attention to duty, and obedience, as are required from pupil-teachers.

81. A vacancy caused by the withdrawal of an assistant in the course of any school year (Article 13) may be supplied by the appointment of temporary monitors, pursuant to Articles 74, 75, or of another assistant, qualified according to Article 79.

82. Assistants make their own terms with the managers, both as to hours and wages.

82. (*a*). Assistants are counted as part of the school staff (Article 39) from the date at which their appointments are notified to, and approved by, the Education Department.

PART II.

TRAINING SCHOOLS.

SECTION I.

83. A training school includes—

(*a.*) A college, for boarding, lodging, and instructing candidates for the office of teacher in elementary schools; and

(*b.*) A practising department, in which such candidates may learn the exercise of their profession.

84. No grant is made to a training school unless the Education Department is satisfied with the premises, management, and staff.

SECTION II.

GRANTS TO TRAINING SCHOOLS.

85. Annual grants are made to the practising departments on the same conditions as to other public elementary schools.

86. Grants are placed to the credit of each college of £100 for every master, and of £70 for every mistress who, having been trained in such college during two years, has, since December 1862,—

(*a.*) completed the prescribed period of probation (Article 51), and become qualified to receive a certificate as a teacher in a public elementary school, or in a training college;

(*b.*) been reported by the proper department in each case to have completed a like period of good service as an elementary teacher in the Army or Royal Navy, or (within Great Britain) in Poor Law Schools, Certified Industrial Schools, or Certified Reformatories.

87. Teachers who have been trained for one year only may obtain certificates after probation (Article 51), or may be reported by the proper department, upon the same terms as others; and grants, of

half the amounts specified in Article 86, may be placed to the credit of the colleges in which they were trained, provided—

(*a.*) they completed their training before 1st January 1864; *or*

(*b.*) are teachers of infants, having—

1, received a complete and special course of training for that service in their colleges, which must have been previously recognised by the Education Department as providing such a course; and

2, undergone their probation in infant schools.

88. *(Lapsed Article.)*

89. The annual grant to each college is paid out of the sums placed to its credit (Articles 86, 87), and must not exceed—

(*a.*) 75 per cent. of the expenditure of the college for the year, certified in such manner as their Lordships may require.

(*b.*) £50 for each male, and £35 for each female, Queen's scholar (Article 96), in residence for continuous training throughout the year for which it is being paid.

90. The annual grant to each college is paid as follows:—

(*a.*) An instalment of £12 (males), or £8 (females) is paid on 1st March, 1st June, and 1st September, in respect of every Queen's scholar (Article 96) in residence for continuous training throughout the year.

(*b.*) The balance is adjusted as soon as the college accounts for the year have been closed, audited, and approved by the Education Department.

Section III.

Admission into Training Schools.

91. An examination of candidates for admission into training schools is annually held at each college in December, during the week following the examination for certificates (Article 100).

92. The examination extends to the subjects required in the course of a pupil-teacher's engagement (Schedule I).

93. The candidates are selected, and admitted to the examination, by the authorities of each training school on their own responsibility, subject to no other conditions, on the part of the Education Department, than the candidates—

(*a.*) intend *bonâ fide* to adopt and follow the profession of teacher in schools fulfilling the conditions of Article 86 (*a*) or (*b*).

(*b.*) having been pupil-teachers, have successfully completed their engagement.

(*c.*) not having been pupil-teachers, will be more than 18 years of age on the 1st of January next following the date of the examination. This article will apply to pupil-teachers whose engagement may have been determined under section 5 of the memorandum agreement (Article 70 *f*), (1) without discredit to themselves, and (2) for reasons approved by the Education Department.

94. The successful candidates are arranged in two classes in order of merit.

95. The authorities of each training school may propose to the Education Department for admission any candidate declared to be admissible pursuant to Article 94.

96. Such candidates when admitted are termed *Queen's Scholars.*

97. Before candidates are admitted—

(*a.*) The medical officer of the training school must certify the state of their health to be satisfactory, and that they are free from serious bodily defect, or deformity; and,

(*b.*) They must sign a declaration signifying their intention conformably to Article 93 (*a*).

98. The authorities of each college settle their own terms of admission.

99. Upon proof by the authorities of any college that candidates have not fulfilled the conditions signed by them on admission into the college, the Education Department will refuse to grant teachers' certificates (Article 53) to such candidates, or to admit them to probation for certificates (Article 51).

Section IV.

Examination of Students in Training Schools.

100. An examination of the resident students is held in December at the several colleges. The day fixed for the commencement of this examination is printed on the syllabus (Article 45) from year to year.

101. No student may be presented for examination except such as, at the date of their admission, satisfied Article 93, and have been resident throughout the whole year. No such student may be left out.

102. The students have a different examination according as they are males or females, or are at the end of a first or second year of residence.

103. The first year's syllabus for females includes special subjects for the teachers of infants. Candidates who pass in these subjects, and complete their probation (Article 51) in schools for infants, receive special mention thereof (*stamp*) on their certificates.

104. Students who pass successfully through two years of training receive special mention thereof (*stamp*) on their certificates.

105. Students who fall into the fourth division at the end of the first year's residence are required to take up the first year's subjects again at the end of their second year.

Part III.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

Evening Scholars.

106. The managers of any school to which annual inspection has already been promised (Article 11) may apply in writing, before the 1st of February, to *the Inspector of the district* for an examination of their evening scholars (Article 22). The application must be renewed annually.

107. Only one examination is held per annum of evening scholars in the same school, and it may be held on any day, between the 1st

of March and 30th of April, that may be arranged with the Inspector, provided that the school has met the required number of times (Article 22) since the date of the last examination.

108. *If the evening school is connected with a day school, in receipt of annual grants*, the grant for the examination of the evening scholars is paid as part of the next annual grant to the whole school (Article 13).

109. *If the evening school is not connected with a day school, in receipt of annual grants*, the grant is paid as soon as possible after the 30th of April; at which date, in such cases, the evening school year is considered to end.

110. The Inspector may make arrangements for the examination, at some convenient centre, of the evening scholars of several schools.

111. A separate examination will not be held for any school, unless 20 scholars are to be presented to the inspector. If less than 20 scholars are to be presented, they can be examined only at a collective examination (Article 110), or at the same time with the day scholars. The number to be presented must be stated in the managers' annual application (Article 106) to the inspector.

112. The inspector may either hold the examination himself, or entrust it to an assistant approved by the department.

Fourth Schedule.

"One or more Specific Subjects of Secular Instruction."

(*See* Article 21.)

Memorandum.

The specific subjects of secular instruction may be,—

Geography, History, Grammar, Algebra, Geometry, Natural Philosophy, Physical Geography, the Natural Sciences, Political Economy, Languages, or *any* definite subject of instruction, extending over the classes to be examined in Standards IV., V., VI., and taught according to a graduated scheme, of which the inspector can report that it is well adapted to the capacity of the children, and is sufficiently distinct from the ordinary Reading Book Lessons to justify its description as a "Specific Subject of Instruction."

It is not improbable that new plans may be proposed, by which children may be enabled to gain scientific ideas from the study of natural objects and from careful direction of their power of observation. Such plans would necessarily differ in town and country, and the suitability of each to the school in which it is adopted must be a matter of discretion. Teachers intending to introduce an extra subject should confer with the inspector, when he visits the school, and settle with him the plan to be pursued during the year, so as to ensure its acceptance at the next examination of the school. Article 21 prescribes that the extra subject must have been taught regularly throughout the year. Unless specific information is given to the inspector at least six months before his annual visit, as to the course of instruction which has been pursued, no examination in the extra subject will be held.

Drawing and music will not be accepted under Article 21.

As specimens of what is meant by graduation of the instruction to the different standards, the following examples may be given:—

Geography.

Standard IV.—A knowledge of the chief divisions of the world, and of the meaning of a map.

Standard V.—The preceding, and rivers, mountains, and divisions of England and Wales; with some special knowledge of the country in which the school is situated, and a map drawing of it.

Standard VI.—A more general knowledge of Great Britain and Ireland, the countries of Europe, and chief rivers, capitals, mountains, &c., with map drawing of portions of England, and a knowledge of the general lines of railway communication.

History.

Select some century or period of importance in the history of England since the Conquest, and let the children in Standard IV. know something about it in detail.

Standard V.—Two or three such periods.

Standard VI.—Three or four more, well mastered, and the general sequence of the landmarks of history.

The facts in English history connected with the village, district, town, or county should be made subjects of instruction.

Algebra.

Standard IV.—Notation, addition, subtraction.

Standard V.—Multiplication and division (integral indices only).

Standard VI.—To simple equations, inclusive.

Languages.

A. *English grammar or literature.*

1. Grammar and analysis increasing in difficulty with each standard.
2. English literature.

Standard IV.—Not less than 150 lines of a prose author, or 200 lines of poetry, got by heart, and the meaning and allusions mastered.

Standard V.—Not less than 180 lines of prose, or 250 lines of poetry, as above.

Standard VI.—Not less than 200 lines of prose, or 300 lines of poetry, as above.

Passages learnt in a previous standard not to be repeated in a subsequent one. At the inspector's visit the passages selected for the ensuing year to be submitted to him for approval.

B. *Elements of Latin, French, or German.*

Standard IV.—Early portion of the grammar, up to verbs.

Standard V.—Regular verbs and first rules of Syntax. Translate short sentences of three or four words into English, and to pronounce correctly.

Standard VI.—Irregular verbs—translation of sentences a little longer, and of short simple sentences from English into the language—to read in the language with tolerable good pronunciation.

Physical Geography.

Standard IV.—Figure of the earth; distribution of sea and land; form of continents.

Standard V.—The preceding and mountain systems. Divisions of ocean; ocean currents.

Standard VI.—The preceding and atmospheric phenomena. Trade winds. Distribution of plants and animals, and races of men.

Animal Physiology.

Standard IV.—The build of the human body, and the names and positions of internal parts.

Standard V.—Constituents of the blood, muscle, bone. Circulation and respiration.

Standard VI.—The preceding and alimentation. The sense organs. The muscles and nerves.

APPENDIX (C).

REGULATIONS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON, FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF ITS SCHOOLS.

I.—General Regulations.

(1) & (2) Mixed or separate schools.

1. Infant schools shall be mixed.

2. Senior schools shall be separate.

(3) Large or small schools.

3. Large schools shall be provided wherever it is practicable to do so.

(4) Employment of female teachers.

4. As a general rule, female teachers only shall be employed in infant and girls' schools.

(5) & (6) Hours of instruction.

5. The period during which the children are under actual instruction in school shall be five hours daily for five days in the week.

6. During the time of religious teaching or religious observance, any children withdrawn from such teaching or observance shall receive separate instruction in secular subjects.

(7) Corporal punishment

7. Every occurrence of corporal punishment shall be formally recorded in a book kept for the purpose. Pupil-teachers are absolutely prohibited from inflicting such punishment. The head teacher shall be held directly responsible for every punishment of the kind.

(8) Music and drill.

8. Music and drill shall be taught in every school during part of the time devoted to actual instruction.

(9) Religious and moral instruction.

9. In all day schools provision shall be made for giving effect to the following resolution of the board passed on the 8th March, 1871 :—

"That in the schools provided by the board the Bible shall be read, and there shall be given such explanations and such instruction therefrom in the principles of morality and religion, as are suited to the capacities of children: provided always—

1. That in such explanations and instruction the provisions of the Act in Sections VII. and XIV. be strictly observed, both in letter and spirit, and that no attempt be made in any such schools to attach children to any particular denomination.
2. That in regard of any particular school, the board shall consider and determine upon any application by managers, parents, or ratepayers of the district, who may show special cause for exception of the school from the operation of this resolution, in whole or in part."

(10) Prayers and hymns.

10. In all schools provision may be made for giving effect to the following resolution of the board passed on July 26th, 1871:—

"1. That in accordance with the general practice of existing elementary schools, provision may be made for offering prayer and using hymns in schools provided by the board at the 'time or times' when, according to Section VII., Sub-section II., of the Elementary Education Act, 'religious observances' may be 'practised.'

"2. That the arrangements for such 'religious observances' be left to the discretion of the teacher and managers of each school, with the right of appeal to the board by teacher, managers, parents, or ratepayers of the district:

Provided always—

"That in the offering of any prayers, and in the use of any hymns, the provisions of the Act in Sections VII. and XIV. be strictly observed, both in letter and spirit, and that no attempt be made to attach children to any particular denomination."

(11) to (14) Fees.

11. All the children in any one infant, junior, or senior school, shall pay the same weekly fees.

12. The minimum weekly fee in infant, junior, and senior schools, shall be one penny, and the maximum fee ninepence.

13. The half-timers attending any school shall pay half the weekly fees chargeable in that school, provided that such half-fees be not less than one penny.

14. The fees payable in evening schools shall be left to the discretion of the managers, subject to the approval of the board.

(15) Free schools.

15. If exceptional circumstances should appear to render the establishment of a free school, in any locality, expedient, the facts shall be brought before the board, and its decision taken upon the special case.

II.—Regulations for Infant Schools.

16. In infant schools instruction shall be given in the following subjects:—

(a) Bible reading and instruction.

(a.) The Bible, and the principles of religion and morality, in accordance with the terms of the resolution of the board passed on the 8th March, 1871.

(b) Reading, writing and arithmetic.

(b.) Reading, writing, and arithmetic.

(c) Object lessons.

(c.) Object lessons of a simple character, with some such exercise of the hands and eyes as is given in the "Kinder-Garten" system.

(d) Music and drill.

(d.) Music and drill.

III.—Regulations for Junior and Senior Schools.

Essential and discretionary subjects.

17. In junior and senior schools, certain kinds of instruction shall form an essential part of the teaching of every school; but others may or may not be added to them, at the discretion of the managers of individual schools, or by the special direction of the board. The instruction in discretionary subjects shall not interfere with the efficiency of the teaching of the essential subjects.

18. The following subjects shall be essential.

(a) Bible reading and instruction.

(a.) The Bible, and the principles of religion and morality, in accordance with the terms of the resolution of the board, passed on the 8th March, 1871.

(b) Reading, writing and arithmetic.

(b.) Reading, writing, and arithmetic; English grammar and composition, and the principles of book-keeping in senior schools; with mensuration in senior boys' schools.

(c) Object lessons.

(c.) Systematized object-lessons, embracing in the six school years a course of elementary instruction in physical science, and serving as an introduction to the science examinations which are conducted by the Science and Art Department.

(d) History of England.

(d.) The History of England.

(e) Geography.

(e.) Elementary geography.

(f) Social economy.

(f.) Elementary social economy.

(g) Elementary drawing.

(g.) Elementary drawing.

(*h.*) Music and drill. (*h*) Music and drill.

(*i.*) In girls' schools, plain needlework and cutting-out. (*i*) Plain needlework and cutting out.

19. The following subjects shall be discretionary :—

(*a.*) Domestic economy. (*a*) Domestic economy.

(*b.*) Algebra. (*b*) Algebra.

(*c.*) Geometry. (*c*) Geometry.

20. Subject to the approbation of the board, any extra subjects recognised by the New Code (1871) shall be considered to be discretionary subjects.

IV.—Regulations for Evening Schools.

21. The course of instruction in evening schools shall be of the same general character as that already recommended for the junior and senior day schools.

22. Evening schools shall be separate.

23. The resolution of the board on religious instruction, adopted 8th March, 1871, shall, in regard to evening schools, be interpreted as permissive, at the discretion of the managers; provided, always, that any religious instruction, given in such schools, shall be subject to the said resolution.

24. Except in so far as the course of instruction has been defined by Regulations 21 and 23, the managers of evening schools shall be left free to adapt the instruction given in the schools to local requirements.

25. The formation of Science and Art classes, in connection with the evening schools, shall be encouraged and facilitated.

BYE-LAWS OF THE SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON.

Know all men by these presents that—

At a meeting of the School Board for London, duly convened and held at the Guildhall, in the City of London, on Wednesday, the 15th day of November, 1871, at which meeting a quorum of the members of the Board are present, the said Board do hereby, in pursuance of the powers to them given by the Elementary Education Act, 1870, and subject to the approval of the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, make and ordain the following bye-laws :—

I. In these bye-laws—

Terms importing males includes females.

The term "school" means either a public elementary school or any other school at which efficient elementary instruction is given.

The term "public elementary school" means a school or department

of a school at which elementary education is the principal part of the education given, and at which the ordinary payments in respect of instruction do not exceed ninepence a week, and which is conducted in accordance with the regulations contained in the 7th section of the Elementary Education Act.

The term "board" or "school board" means the school board for London.

II. The parent of every child of not less than five years, nor more than thirteen years of age, is required to cause such child to attend school, unless there be some reasonable excuse for non-attendance.

III. Except as hereinafter provided, the time during which every such child is required to attend school, is the whole time for which the school selected shall be open for the instruction of children, not being less than twenty-five hours a week, except on Sundays, and except also that nothing herein contained shall prevent the withdrawal of any child from any religious observance or instruction in religious subjects or shall require any child to attend school on any day exclusively set apart for religious observance by the religious body to which his parent belongs.

IV. (1.) A child of not less than ten years of age, who has obtained from one of Her Majesty's Inspectors a certificate that he has reached a standard equivalent to the fifth standard of the Government New Code of 1871, shall be altogether exempt from obligation to attend school, and

(2.) A child of not less than ten years of age who shows, to the satisfaction of the board, that he is beneficially and necessarily at work, shall be exempt from the obligation to attend school during the whole time for which the school shall be opened as aforesaid, but every such child is required to attend school for at least ten hours in every week in which the school is opened as aforesaid, and in computing for the purpose of this section the time during which a child has attended any school, there shall not be included any time during which such child has attended either.

(*a.*) In excess of three hours at any one time, or in excess of five hours on any one day, or

(*b.*) On Sundays.

V. Provided always, that if and whenever Bye-laws III. and IV., or either of them, shall be contrary to, or inconsistent with, the regulations affecting any child subject thereto contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour, the said regulations shall prevail, and the said bye-laws shall affect such child only to such extent as they are consistent with the said regulations.

VI. In addition to the reasonable excuses for the non-attendance of a child at school mentioned in the Act, viz.:—

(1.) That the child is under efficient instruction in some other manner.

(2.) That the child has been prevented from attending school by sickness or any unavoidable cause.

(3.) It shall be a reasonable excuse for his non-attendance that there is no public elementary school open which

such child can attend within one mile, measured according to the nearest road from the residence of such child.

VII. Every parent who shall not observe, or shall neglect, or violate these bye-laws, or any of them, shall upon conviction be liable to a penalty not exceeding *5s.*, including costs, for each offence.

In witness whereof we, the school board for London, have hereunto set our common seal this 15th day of November, 1871.

Sealed in the presence of

L. S.

LAWRENCE,
Chairman.

G. H. CROAD,
Clerk of the Board.

SCHOOL BOARD FOR LONDON.

Arrangements for putting in force the bye-laws under Section 74 *of the Elementary Education Act.*

All committees, sub-committees, clerks of committees, visitors, and superintendents of visitors now existing shall continue, and shall be, as from the 27*th June,* 1872, *subject to the following regulations :—*

I. There shall be a committee for each of the ten divisions of the metropolis, consisting of the members for that division, and of such other persons, if any, as the board may from time to time appoint upon the written nomination of the said members, or a majority of them, and every such committee is herein called a divisional committee. Every divisional committee shall have power to nominate for appointment by the board a duly qualified person to act as clerk to the committee, and as superintendent of visitors within his division under the direction and control of the said committee.

II. Every divisional committee shall have the power to sub-divide its division of the metropolis into sub-divisions, and to form sub-committees. Every sub-committee shall report only to the divisional committee. Provided always that every member of the board for the division shall *ex officio* be a member of each of the sub-committees, and that no person shall be put upon a sub-committee without the consent of a majority of the members of the division.

III. Every divisional committee, shall be a body of managers, within the meaning of the 15th section of the Elementary Education Act, for the purpose of carrying out the bye-laws, and shall be subject to the provisions contained in the third schedule to the Act relating to managers.

IV. The board hereby delegate to every committee the following

powers, and every committee may, at their discretion, and shall, whenever thereunto required by the board, carry the said powers into execution, viz. :—

(1.) To enforce the bye-laws of the board within the division of the metropolis in respect of which such committee has been appointed.

(2.) To divide its division into districts, so that each district may be of such size and population as to be manageable by one visitor.

(3.) To nominate for appointment by the board as many visitors for the division as there are districts in it.

(4.) To direct and control the visitors.

(5.) To consider applications for the payment or remission of school fees, and to report to the board upon all such applications as should, in their opinion, be assented to.

(6.) To fix its own quorum and the quorum of any sub-committees which it may from time to time appoint.

(7.) To report to the board, as soon as practicable after every quarter-day, as to

(*a.*) the operations of the visitors;

(*b.*) the proceedings taken to enforce the bye-laws;

(*c.*) the attendance of children in efficient elementary schools

in the division during the preceding quarter.

V. Every visitor so appointed as aforesaid, and every superintendent of visitors shall be an officer of the board within the meaning of the 35th and 36th sections of the Act, and shall be paid such salary or remuneration (if any) as the board shall from time to time think fit.

VI. It shall be the duty of the visitor of a district to act generally under the control and direction of the committee in whose division his district is situated, and in particular

(1.) He shall keep a schedule of the names and addresses of all the children of not less than five nor more than ten years of age, and of all the children of not less than ten nor more than thirteen years of age, within his district, and such schedule shall show—

(*a.*) The names of those children who are expected to attend school.

(*b.*) The school at which each such child is expected to attend.

(*c.*) The names of the children alleged to be receiving efficient instruction in some other manner.

(*d.*) Such particulars respecting that other instruction as will enable the committee to judge of its efficiency.

(*e.*) The names of children not attending any school, and the reasons alleged for their non-attendance.

And every visitor shall produce the said schedule to the committee at such times as such committee shall appoint.

(2.) He shall also from time to time furnish to the master of every school, at which any children within his district are expected to attend, the names and addresses of such children.

(3.) He shall investigate applications made by parents for the payment or remission of school fees on the alleged ground of poverty,

and ascertain the truth thereof, and report thereon to the superintendent of visitors.

(4.) He shall report all cases of infringement of any of the bye-laws by any parent within his district to the superintendent of visitors.

(5.) He shall report all cases, which may come under his notice in the discharge of his duties, of the infringement, within his district, of the Workshops Act or of any other Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour, to the superintendent of visitors.

(6.) He shall report also to the superintendent of visitors, all cases of children within his district who are liable, under the Industrial Schools Act, 1866, to be sent to a certified industrial school.

VII. The following shall be considered to be breaches of the bye-laws :—

(*a.*) Absence of a child of less than ten years of age from the school which he is expected to attend for one whole day or two half-days in one week.

(*b.*) Frequent irregularity in the attendance of a child at such school, unless, in either case, sickness, or other reasonable cause is shown for the non-attendance.

VIII. Whenever an infringement of any bye-law is reported to a committee, or to a superintendent of visitors, it shall be the duty of the visitor or of some other officer appointed by the board for that purpose, to visit the home of the child in whose case a bye-law has been infringed, and to ascertain the cause thereof, and he may then, or at a subsequent time, subject to the direction of the committee, serve upon the parent of such child a notice in the form, or to the effect, of the Form A hereunder stated, and he shall, unless prevented by the parent, read over and explain such notice, and the consequences of neglecting to comply therewith to the parent.

IX. The particulars of each notice served upon a parent shall be recorded by the officer serving the same, in duplicate, in books to be provided by the board, one of which books shall be laid before the committee of his division at each of its ordinary meetings.

X. Upon the day named in any Notice A for the appearance of a parent before a committee, that committee, or any member or members thereof appointed in that behalf, shall hear the statements of the officer and of the parent, if he appear, and of any other person, and the said committee, or member or members, may direct that the said notice shall stand or be suspended, or be withdrawn, according to the circumstances.

XI. In cases where Notice A, not having been suspended or withdrawn, has been disobeyed, the superintendent of visitors shall report the fact to the divisional members ; and if they or a majority of those present shall so determine, it shall then be the duty of the visitor, or of some other officer appointed by the board for that purpose, to serve upon the parent of the child, a notice in the form or to the effect of the Form B hereunder stated ; and upon the day named in any Notice B for the appearance of the parent before a committee, that committee, or any member or members thereof appointed in that behalf, shall hear the statements of the officer and of the parent, if he appear, and of any other person, and the said

committee, or member or members, may recommend that the said notice should stand, or be suspended or withdrawn, according to the circumstances, and shall enter such recommendation in the said books; and the members for the division, or a majority of those present, shall, after considering such recommendation, direct that the said notice shall stand or be suspended, or be withdrawn, according to the circumstances, and if the notice be directed to stand, then the superintendent, or other officer appointed by the board in that behalf, shall forthwith, or at such time as shall be directed by the members for the division, or a majority of those present, take the necessary proceedings to enforce the bye-law so infringed, as aforesaid, and to recover the penalty imposed by the bye-laws for the breach thereof.

XII. The result of every proceeding taken as aforesaid shall be recorded by the officer taking the same, in duplicate, in books to be provided by the board, and to be laid before the committee at the same times as the books mentioned in Clause IX.

XIII. The board reserves to itself the right of, from time to time, and at all times, absolutely directing every such committee, or sub-committee, body of managers, superintendent of visitors, visitor, and officer as aforesaid as to any and everything which they, or he, are, or is, or are not, or is not to do in the matters entrusted to them, and removing all or any of such members of committees, managers, superintendents, visitors, and officers, and of adding to or diminishing their number, and of otherwise altering their constitution and powers.

XIV. In the clauses of these arrangements terms importing males include females.

APPENDIX (D).

SPECIAL POINTS AND PROVISIONS IN THE SCOTCH ACT.

The following is the title and preamble of the Act:—

"An Act to amend and extend the provisions of the Law of Scotland on the subject of Education. [6th August, 1872.]

"Whereas an Act was passed by the Parliament of Scotland, in the First Parliament of King William, in the year one thousand six hundred and ninety-six, intituled 'Act for settling of Schools:'

Act of 1696.

"And whereas another Act was passed in the session of the forty-third year of the reign of his Majesty King George the Third, chapter fifty-four, intituled 'An Act for making better provision for the Parochial Schoolmasters, and for making further regulations for the better government of the Parish Schools, in Scotland;' and another Act was passed in the session of the first and second years of the reign of her present Majesty, chapter eighty-seven, intituled 'An Act to facilitate the foundation and endowment

43 G. 3, c. 54.

1 & 2 Vict. c. 87.

of additional Schools in Scotland;' and another Act was passed in the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of her present Majesty, chapter one hundred and seven, intituled 'The Parochial and Burgh Schoolmasters (Scotland) Act, 1861:' 24 & 25 Vict. c. 107.

"And whereas it is desirable to amend and extend the provisions of the law of Scotland on the subject of education, in such manner that the means of procuring efficient education for their children may be furnished and made available to the whole people of Scotland:

"And whereas it has been the custom in the public schools of Scotland to give instruction in religion to children whose parents did not object to the instruction so given, but with liberty to parents, without forfeiting any of the other advantages of the schools, to elect that their children should not receive such instruction, and it is expedient that the managers of public schools shall be at liberty to continue the said custom:

"Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:"

Then follows the definition of terms, and the provision as to expenses of the department.

Then, as to the Board of Education for Scotland, it is enacted as follows:—

"3. With a view to greater efficiency and convenience in the institution and organization of schools and school boards under the provisions of this Act, a Board of Education for Scotland shall be and is hereby established, to endure for the term of three years from and after the passing of this Act, with power to her Majesty, by Order in Council made before the expiration of that term, to extend the same for a further period of not more than two years; and with respect to the constitution of the said board the following provisions shall have effect:

"(1.) The board shall consist of five members to be appointed by her Majesty, to hold office during her Majesty's pleasure. Any vacancy occurring during the subsistence of the board shall be supplied by a new appointment. One of the members shall be nominated by her Majesty to be chairman of the board, and with power to him to appoint any other member to be deputy-chairman, and in the absence of the chairman and deputy-chairman at any meeting of the board, the members present may nominate one of their number to act as chairman of the meeting. Two members shall be a quorum.

"(2.) The office and general place of business of the board shall be in Edinburgh.

"(3.) Her Majesty shall appoint a fit person to be secretary of the board to hold office during her Majesty's pleasure, and the board shall appoint such necessary clerks and officers as shall be sanctioned by the Lords of her Majesty's Treasury, to hold office during the pleasure of the board.

"(4.) The board may from time to time appoint any one or more of their number to perform special duties connected with the execution of this Act, and to visit such places as may be necessary for that purpose, and in the performance of their duties the member or members so appointed shall be responsible to the board and subject to their control.

"(5.) The ordinary meetings of the board shall be held in Edinburgh, and it shall be the duty of the chairman or some other member of the board, as may from time to time be arranged, and of the secretary, to give regular attendance in the office of the board at ordinary business hours during at least nine months in the year, unless when absent on the business of the board or prevented by reasonable cause.

"(6.) The board and the members thereof shall be responsible to the Scotch Education Department, and on the expiration of the original or extended term of their endurance their powers and duties shall devolve and are hereby devolved upon the said department, and thereafter the various clauses and provisions of this Act in which the term 'Board of Education' occurs shall be construed and have effect as if the term 'Scotch Education Department' were substituted therefor."

Directions having been given as to the meeting and the powers of the Scotch board, and as to the area and constitution of school districts, and the election powers of school boards, the following clauses define the relation of the school board to the former parish schools and burgh schools.

Parish schools.

"23. The parish and other schools which have been established, and now exist in any parish under the recited Acts, or any of them, together with teachers' houses and land attached thereto, shall be vested in and be under the management of the school board of such parish, or if situated in a burgh, then of the school board of such burgh, unless such parish school is the parish school of the landward district of a parish partly landward and partly

burgal, in which case it shall be under the management of the school board of such district from and after the election of such school board, and the said school board shall thereafter, with respect to school management and the election of teachers, and generally with respect to all powers, obligations, and duties in regard to such schools now vested in or incumbent on the heritors qualified according to the existing law and the minister of the parish, supersede and come in the place of such heritors and minister; and all jurisdiction, power, and authority possessed or exercised by presbyteries or other church courts with respect to any public schools in Scotland are hereby abolished: Provided that nothing in this section contained shall defeat or prejudice any right or title to the land whereon any such school or teachers houses shall be built, other than that of the heritors or others being managers of such school, or shall defeat or prejudice any charge, burden, or liability to which such land or houses may be subject.

Burgh schools.

"24. Every burgh school shall be vested in and be under the management of the school board of the burgh in which the same is situated from and after the election of such school board, and the said school board shall thereafter, with respect to school management and the election of teachers, and generally with respect to all powers and duties in regard to such schools now vested in the town council and magistrates, or other authorities in whom the school management and election of the schoolmasters and teachers is at present vested, supersede and come in the place of such town council and magistrates or other authorities.

Public schools.

"25. Every school under the management of the school board of a parish shall be deemed a parish school, and every school under the management of the school board of a burgh shall be deemed a burgh school, and all such schools are hereby declared to be public schools within the meaning of this Act; but nothing in this Act contained shall prejudice or affect the right of the teacher of any existing parish school, which, under the operation of this Act, may be deemed to be a burgh school, or his successors in office, to participate in the benefits of any bequest for behoof of the teachers of parochial schools, or the powers, rights, and privileges of the trustees or administrators of any such bequests."

It is not needful to transcribe any other part of the Act, except the following, the general arrangements being similar in principle and purpose to those of the English Bill.

As to qualified teachers and University graduates.

Qualified teachers.

"56. No person shall be appointed to the office of principal teacher in a public school who is not the holder of a certificate of competency. But any person who at the time of the passing of this Act is the principal teacher of a

school under the recited Acts or any of them, or of a burgh school, or the holder of a certificate from, or registered as a certificated teacher by, the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education, or who is a teacher in a burgh school and a member of the council of a Scotch University, shall be deemed to be a holder of a certificate of competency.

University degrees may come in place of examination.

"59. When a degree in arts or science of any university in the United Kingdom conferred after an examination in all or any of the subjects specified by the Department as subjects for the examination of candidates for a certificate of competency is held by any such candidate, the examiners may lawfully dispense with his examination in such of the said subjects as he has already been examined in on obtaining the degree."

As to removal of teachers of parish and burgh schools, and other teachers, appointed previously to the passing of the Act.

Removal of teachers.

"60. Any teacher of a public school appointed previously to the passing of this Act may be removed from his office in manner following; that is to say,

"(1.) It shall be lawful to the school board of any parish or burgh to make a complaint to the sheriff of the county, charging any such teacher with immoral conduct or cruel or improper treatment of the scholars under his charge, and specifying in such complaint the particular acts in respect of which the complaint is made; and a copy of such complaint shall be served upon the teacher, who shall be required on an induciæ of eight days to appear before the sheriff to answer to the said complaint, &c.

"(2.) If the school board of any parish or burgh shall consider that any such teacher is incompetent, unfit, or inefficient, they may require a special report regarding the school and the teacher from her Majesty's inspector charged with the duty of inspecting such school; and on receiving such report the school board may if they see cause remove such teacher from office; provided that before proceeding to give judgment on the matter they shall furnish to the teacher a copy of such report, and that a judgment removing the teacher shall not have effect until confirmed by the Board of Education: Provided also, that in the case of teachers of parish schools appointed previously to the passing of this Act who may be so removed, the school boards shall have the same powers of granting retiring allowances, and the teachers shall have the same rights to retiring allowances, as were vested in heritors and ministers and in parish schoolmasters respectively by sections nineteen and twenty of the Parochial and Burgh School-

masters (Scotland) Act, 1861, in the case of parish schoolmasters permitted or required to resign or dismissed or removed from office as therein provided."

As to higher class public schools, burgh schools and parish schools.

"62. With respect to burgh schools existing at the passing of this Act in which the education given does not consist chiefly of elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, but of instruction in Latin, Greek, modern languages, mathematics, natural science, and generally in the higher branches of knowledge, the following provisions shall have effect: Higher class public schools.—Burgh.

"(1.) Such schools shall be deemed to be higher class public schools, and shall be managed by the school boards accordingly, with a view to promote the higher education of the country:

"(2.) A school board having the management of any such school may from time to time fix the standard of qualification of all or any of the teachers to be appointed thereto, and determine the subjects of the examination to be passed by them respectively, and from time to time appoint examiners (who shall be professors of some Scotch university or teachers of distinction in a higher class public school) to conduct the same, and the foregoing enactments regarding certificates of competency shall not apply to teachers of higher class public schools whose qualifications have been fixed and ascertained under this provision; but any person who at the time of the passing of this Act, being a master in a higher class school, is a member of council of any of the universities of Scotland, shall be deemed to be the holder of a certificate of competency for the office of teacher in any of the said higher class schools:

"(3.) The funds and revenues of such schools shall consist of,—1. Contributions payable from the common good of the burghs in which they respectively exist. 2. All endowments applicable to the general purposes of the respective schools. 3. Endowments for the promotion of instruction in particular subjects, or for the benefit of teachers of particular branches in the respective schools; and 4. Fees paid by scholars.

"(4.) A school board having the management of any such school shall, so far as practicable and expedient, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, relieve the same of the necessity of giving elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic to young children, by otherwise providing sufficient public school accommodation for such

elementary instruction, so that the funds and revenues of such higher class school, and the time of the teachers, may be more exclusively applied to giving instruction in the higher branches:

"(5.) The fees to be paid for attendance at any such school shall be fixed from time to time, but at intervals of not less than three years, by the principal teacher and the ordinary teachers thereof, with the approval of the school board, subject to the determination of the Board of Education in the event of difference of opinion:

"(6.) Every such school shall, with reference to the higher branches of knowledge taught therein, be annually examined by examiners appointed and employed for that purpose by the school board, &c.

Higher class public schools.—Parish.

"63. When from the existence of any endowment or foundation in whatever form, or in whatever terms, or from any other cause, a parish school existing at the passing of this Act is in the condition of being a school in which instruction in the higher branches of knowledge is given to such extent, and to such a number of scholars, that it is not reasonably to be considered as chiefly an elementary school, it shall be lawful for the school board having the management thereof by resolution passed and approved of in manner provided in the preceding clause with reference to burgh schools, to resolve that it shall be deemed to be a higher class public school, to be managed according to the provisions of the foregoing section, and thereafter such school shall be subject to the said provisions so far as applicable to the circumstances thereof."

As to Parliamentary grants—

Parliamentary grant.

"67. Parliamentary grants according to the rates and under the conditions contained in the minutes of the Scotch Education Department in force for the time may be made—

"(1.) To any school board for and in respect of the public schools under their management:

"(2.) To the managers of any school which is, in the opinion of the Scotch Education Department, efficiently contributing to the secular education of the parish or burgh in which it is situated; provided that such conditions shall not give any preference of advantage to any school on the ground that it is or is not provided by a school board.

"Provided, that due care shall be taken by the Scotch Education Department, in the construction of such minutes, that the standard of education which now exists in the public schools shall not be lowered, and that, as far as possible, as high a standard shall be maintained in all schools inspected by the said department, and provided that no such minute shall be in force until it has lain for not less than one month on the table of both Houses of Parliament.

"Provided also, that parliamentary grants shall not be made for or in respect of—

"(*a.*) Instruction in religious subjects:

"(*b.*) A school established after the passing of this Act, not being a public school, unless the said department shall after due inquiry be satisfied that no sufficient provision exists for the children for whom the school is intended, regard being had to the religious belief of their parents, or that it is otherwise specially required in the locality where it is situated.

"No parliamentary grant shall be made in aid of building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up any school, except in pursuance of a written application from a school board, containing the information required by the Scotch Education Department for enabling them to decide thereon, and sent to the said department on or before the thirty-first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, but without prejudice to applications made prior to the passing of this Act being dealt with according to the existing laws, and with respect to any parish situated in the counties of Inverness, Argyll, Ross, and Orkney and Shetland, where a school rate of not less than ninepence in the pound on the rateable value of such parish has been levied, such grant as aforesaid may be made of an amount not exceeding three hundred pounds for each school and one hundred pounds for each teacher's residence, without regard to the amount contributed by the school board out of the school fund or otherwise, or by local subscription, towards the building, enlarging, improving, or fitting up such school or residence; and in any parish so situated where a school rate of not less than threepence in the pound on the rateable value of the parish has been levied, the annual parliamentary grant to a school shall not be reduced by its excess above the income of the school derived from fees, rates, and subscriptions.

The Conscience Clause.

Conscience clause.

"68. Every public school, and every school subject to inspection and in receipt of any public money as hereinbefore provided, shall be open to children of all denominations, and any child may be withdrawn by his parents from any instruction in religious subjects and from any religious observance in any such school; and no child shall in any such school be placed at any disadvantage with respect to the secular instruction given therein by reason of the denomination to which such child or his parents belong, or by reason of his being withdrawn from any instruction in religious subjects. The time or times during which any religious observance is practised or instruction in religious subjects is given at any meeting of the school for elementary instruction shall be either at the beginning or at the end,

or at the beginning and at the end of such meeting, and shall be specified in a table approved of by the Scotch Education Department.

Provision as to payment of fees in case of indigence.

Parents to provide elementary education for their children, and when unable to pay fees to apply to parochial board.

"69. It shall be the duty of every parent to provide elementary education in reading, writing, and arithmetic for his children, between five and thirteen years of age, and if unable from poverty to pay therefor, to apply to the parochial board of the parish or burgh in which he resides, and it shall be the duty of the said board to pay out of the poor fund the ordinary and reasonable fees for the elementary education of every such child, or such part of such fees as the parent shall be unable to pay, in the event of such board being satisfied of the inability of the parent to pay such fees, and the provisions of this clause shall apply to the education of blind children, but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any school in receipt of the parliamentary grant other than such as may be selected by the parent.

Defaulting parents may be proceeded against by the procurator fiscal on a certificate from the board.

"70. It shall be the duty of every school board to appoint an officer to ascertain and report to the school board what parents, resident within the parish or burgh, have failed and omitted, and are failing and omitting, to perform the duty of providing for their children such elementary education as aforesaid, and it shall be the duty of such officer to keep the school board constantly informed of the names and designations of all such parents; and the clerk of the school board or some other appointed by the school board for that duty, shall keep, and from time to time revise, add to, and correct a list of all such parents and their children who have not received and are not in course of receiving such elementary education as aforesaid; and the school board is hereby authorised to summon any such parent to appear before the school board at any meeting thereof, and to require from him every information and explanation respecting his failure of duty with respect to the education of his child or children; and if he shall either fail to appear or on his appearance to satisfy the school board that he has not failed in such duty without reasonable excuse for such failure, and shall not undertake to the satisfaction of the school board to perform such duty by forthwith providing such elementary education as aforesaid for his children, it shall be lawful to and shall be the duty of the school board to certify in writing that he has been and is grossly and without reasonable excuse failing to discharge the duty of providing elementary education for his child or children, and on such certificate being transmitted to the procurator fiscal of the county or district of the county in which the parent resides, or other person appointed by the school board, he shall prosecute such parent before the sheriff of the county for such failure of duty as is in the certificate

specified, and on conviction the parent shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty shillings, or to imprisonment not exceeding fourteen days; and such procedure as aforesaid may be repeated against the same parent, and in respect of a continuance of the same failure of duty, at intervals of not less than three months. All fines recovered under this clause shall be paid into the school fund.

Liability of employers of labour.

"72. Any person who receives into his house as a domestic servant, or who employs as a farm servant, or as a worker in a mine, factory, or workshop, or assistant in a shop, a child under the age of thirteen who has not attended school regularly for at least three years between the ages of five and thirteen and is unable to read and write, and who continues such child in his employment after notice from the school board of the parish or burgh, or an officer thereof, that he has not received elementary education, shall be deemed thereby to undertake the duty of a parent with respect to the elementary education of such child, so long as he remains in his employment, and shall be liable to be proceeded against, and to be fined or imprisoned as hereinbefore provided in the case of a parent, should he grossly and without reasonable excuse fail to perform such duty; but the duty of the parent shall not thereby be discharged or diminished, nor shall the parent be thereby exempted from liability to be proceeded against as aforesaid.

Employers of children shall be deemed to undertake the duty of a parent, but parent not thereby exempted from lia-

Exemptions.

"73. A certificate of ability to read and write, and of a knowledge of elementary arithmetic, granted in favour of any child by one of Her Majesty's inspectors, shall exempt the parent and all employers of such child from any prosecution or other proceeding under this Act for neglecting to provide for the education of such child.

SCHEDULE A.

Schedule of Towns.

Name of Town.	Municipal or Managing Body.
Girvan . . .	Bailies and councillors.
Wick & Pulteneytown	Town council and commissioners.
Alloa	Commissioners of police.
Kirkintilloch . .	Bailies, treasurer, and councillors.
Dalkeith . . .	Trustees.
Broughty Ferry . .	Commissioners of police.
Bathgate . . .	Commissioners.
Kilsyth . . .	Bailie and councillors.

SCHEDULE B.

General rules respecting election of members of a school board subsequent to the first election.

1. The number of members of the school board shall be such number, not less than five nor more than fifteen, as may be determined by the Scotch Education Department with respect to each parish and burgh, and, within the said limits, the number of the members of any school board may before any triennial election be changed by the said department.

2. The electors shall consist of all persons being of lawful age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, whose names are entered on the latest valuation roll applicable to the parish or burgh for which the board is to be elected, made up and completed not less than one month prior to the election, as owners or occupiers of lands or heritages of the annual value of not less than four pounds, situated within such parish or burgh, and the valuation roll, or a certified copy thereof, shall be conclusive evidence that the persons therein named had, and continue to have, the qualifications annexed to their names respectively in the said roll.

3. The chairman of the school board shall be the returning officer, and failing him, some person appointed by the school board.

4. The election shall be held at such times, and in such manner, and in accordance with such rules and directions as the Scotch Education Department may from time to time by order prescribe, and the Scottish Education Department may, by order, appoint or direct the appointment of any officers requisite for the purpose of such election, and do all other necessary things preliminary or incidental to such election.

5. All expenses incident to the election of a school board (but not including the expenses of any candidate) in any parish or burgh shall be paid by the said school board out of the school fund.

6. At every election every voter shall be entitled to a number of votes equal to the number of the members of the school board to be elected, and may give all such votes to one candidate or may distribute them among the candidates as he sees fit.

SCHEDULE C.

Name of Burgh.	Name of School.
Aberdeen . . .	New grammar school.
Ayr	Academy.
Dumfries . . .	Academy.
Edinburgh . . .	High school.
Elgin	Academy.
Glasgow . . .	High school.
Haddington . .	Burgh school.
Montrose . . .	Academy.
Paisley . . .	Grammar school and academy.
Perth	Academy.
Stirling . . .	High school.

THE SCOTTISH CODE.

The special feature of the Code for Scotland is that it is arranged with a view to stimulate instruction in the higher branches of knowledge, and so to keep up fully the high character of the best Scottish parish and burgh schools.

The following regulations exemplify this peculiarity :—

Grants to Day Schools.

19. The managers of a school which has met not less than 400* times, in the morning and afternoon, in the course of a year, as defined by Article 13, may claim at the end of such year—

A. The following sums per scholar, according to the average number in attendance throughout the year (Article 26).

(1.) 4*s.*

(2.) 1*s.* if singing forms a part of the ordinary course of instruction.

(3.) 1*s.* 6*d.*, if the inspector reports that the organization discipline are *excellent;* or, 1*s.* if he reports that they are *good.*

The inspector will bear in mind, in reporting on the organization and discipline, the results of any visits of surprise (Article 12,) made in the course of the school year.

B. For every scholar present on the day of examination, who has attended not less than 250* morning or afternoon meetings of the school :—

* *Exceptions :—*

i. If a school is employed for the purpose of taking the poll at a *Parliamentary election*, under Section 6 of the Ballot Act, 1872, the number of meetings during which the managers are deprived of the

1. If above four, and under seven, years of age at the end of the year (Article 13),—
   (*a.*) 8*s.*, *or*
   (*b.*) 10*s.* if the infants are taught as a separate department, by a certificated teacher of their own, in a room properly constructed and furnished for their instruction.
2. If more than seven years of age, subject to examination—
   3*s.* for passing in reading;
   3*s.* for passing in writing;
   3*s.* for passing in arithmetic.
   } Articles 28, 29.

C. 1. The sum of 2*s.* per scholar, according to the average number of children, above 7 years of age, in attendance throughout the year (Article 26), if the scholars present on the day of examination, *in the classes* from which children are examined in Standards II. and III., show an intelligent and grammatical knowledge of the passages read.

2. A further sum of 2*s.* per head on the same average, if *the classes* from which children are examined in Standards IV.—VI., pass creditably in history and geography.

3. The extent of the examination is indicated by the passages printed in italics in Article 28. In districts where Gaelic is spoken the intelligence of the children examined, under this paragraph, in Standards II. and III., may be tested by requiring them to explain in Gaelic the meaning of the passage read.

4. The examination is not confined to the scholars who have made 250 (or 150) attendances; and one half of the children, examined under this paragraph of Article 19, must pass creditably.

5. The mode of examination (whether oral or on paper) is left to the discretion of the inspector.

20. 150 attendances (Article 23) qualify for examination—
   (*a.*) Scholars under any half-time Act.
   (*b.*) Boys above 10 in a rural district.
   (*c.*) Scholars residing two miles or upwards from the school.

21. If the time table of the school, in use throughout the year, has provided for one or more specific subjects of secular instruction according to the table in Schedule IV.—

---

use of the school, *solely* in consequence of its being so employed, may, *if necessary*, be counted in making up,—

1. The 400 meetings of the school; or,
2. The 250 attendances of any scholar who was under instruction in the school the week before it was occupied for election purposes.

ii. If a school claiming annual grants for the first time has not been open for the whole year (Article 13); *or*, if a school has been closed during the year, under medical authority on account of a local epidemic, a proportionate reduction is made for the number of meetings (400) and attendances (250) required by this Article.

a. A grant of 4*s.* per subject may be made for every day scholar, presented in Standards IV.—VI. (Article 28) who passes a satisfactory examination in not more than two of such subjects.

b. Any scholar who has previously passed in Standard VI. may be presented for examination in any *three* of such specific subjects.

c. The amount claimed under this Article is not taken into account in making any reduction under Article 32 (*a.*), 2.

d. No grant may be claimed under this Article on account of any scholar who has been examined, in the same subject, within the preceding year, by the Department of Science and Art.

THE END.

VIRTUE AND CO., PRINTERS, CITY ROAD, LONDON

112798 Educat
Author Rigg, James Harrison R
Title National education and public elementary schools.

DATE. NAME OF BORROWER.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU